

LIBRARY
STATE COLLEGE
MICHIGAN
EAST LANSING
1943

THE CANADIAN FORUM

Twenty-Third Year of Issue

August, 1943

Balloting For A Better World

EDITORIAL



A Discussion On Housing

J. F. C. SMITH



Autobiography

A. M. Klein

The Mourners

William Brown



Planning Post-War Canada

The Case For
Individual Enterprise

J. M. Macdonnell

The Case For
Public Enterprise

F. R. Scott

CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE

O CANADA	98
EDITORIALS	99
BALLOTING FOR A BETTER WORLD	101
C.P.R. SEMANTICS	102
GETTING ACQUAINTED— <i>Tom Irving</i>	103
A DISCUSSION ON HOUSING— <i>J. F. C. Smith</i>	104
AUTOBIOGRAPHY— <i>A. M. Klein</i>	106
PLANNING POST-WAR CANADA	107
THE CASE FOR INDIVIDUAL ENTERPRISE— <i>J. M. Macdonnell</i>	
THE CASE FOR PUBLIC ENTERPRISE— <i>F. R. Scott</i>	
A STEP TOWARDS THE ECONOMIC GOAL— <i>Frederick Bell</i>	111
TREE— <i>Alan Creighton</i>	112
CORRESPONDENCE	113
THE MOURNERS— <i>William Brown</i>	114
THE MENTAL BUTTERFLY— <i>James Wreford</i>	115
LOST INNOCENCE— <i>Rita Smith</i>	115
CHURCH PARADE— <i>Lt. Irving Layton</i>	115

BOOKS OF THE MONTH

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY— <i>F. R. Scott</i>	116
CANADA AND WORLD AFFAIRS	F.H.U. 117
IN QUEST OF FOSTER PARENTS	Elisabeth Wallace 117
THIS IS OUR LAND	Kathleen Coburn 118
THE FORGOTTEN HUME	W.J.M. 118
CONTEMPORARY VERSE— <i>Promise, Christmas Eve, For Remembrance,</i> <i>The Cylindriad</i>	Alan Creighton 119

THE CANADIAN FORUM

Eleanor Godfrey - Managing Editor
Alan Creighton - Assistant Editor
L. A. Morris - Business Manager

Published each month by

CANADIAN FORUM LIMITED

28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Telephone WA. 5118

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: TWO DOLLARS A YEAR

Typography: Service Linotyping Co., Toronto
Press Work: Merchants Press, Toronto.

O CANADA

Every Japanese in Canada should be sent back to Japan when the war is over and . . . only British immigrants should be allowed to enter the Dominion, members of Grand Orange Lodge, British Columbia, urged in resolutions at . . . a three-day convention. If there should be too few British immigrants, Canada should try to assimilate or eliminate the "conglomerate mass we have here," the delegates said . . . It was resolved that Japanese should be "forever prohibited" from acquiring any interest in property of the Dominion . . . There was a protest, too, against use of the French language beyond the privileges of the B.N.A. Act . . . Hon. R. L. Maitland, K.C., told members . . . "We must teach our children the fundamentals of tolerance."
(The Vancouver Daily Province, May 21, 1943.)

Lieut. William R. Allen of the Queen's York Rangers, 24-year-old son of ex-Alderman Robert A. Allen, received the Liberal nomination for Riverdale Riding at a convention in Gerrard Street Masonic Hall last night.

The young, quiet-spoken officer made his appeal as a candidate who had lived in the riding all his life and had played baseball and hockey in every schoolyard.

(The Globe and Mail, Toronto, July 9, 1943.)

Premier Garson urges those who are in sympathy with the coalition government and desirous of seeing it go ahead with its enlightened program to get together and put in the field a candidate acceptable to all shades of ministerial opinion in the constituency . . . Such an arrangement, if it were satisfactory to all groups, would permit a clear-cut decision by the electors between the creditable performance and the practical program of the coalition government and the imaginary pictures of Cloud-Cuckoo-land which the C.C.F. will display for their edification. Where there is a bona fide majority vote for the C.C.F. the election of its candidate is to be welcomed.

(The Winnipeg Free Press, July 3, 1943.)

An authoritative British commentator described Wavell as "a Liberal in the highest sense of the word," who would continue the British Indian policy without change.

(Toronto Daily Star, June 19, 1943.)

Hon. R. L. Maitland, B.C. Attorney-General and Progressive Conservative Leader . . . said the C.C.F.—even C.C.F. members of the Legislature—is controlled by a group which calls itself the executive. Not a person can join the C.C.F., he said, unless that group approves the application; no party organization has power to nominate its own candidates unless the group approves . . .

During question period a member asked Mr. Maitland the attitude of Opposition Leader Harold Winch on the question of the vote for the Japanese. Mr. Maitland said Mr. Winch had been too careful to be definite, but "you will find their sympathies lie in the direction of the Japanese."

Miss Enid Middleton, with Mrs. Parry at the piano, gave much pleasure with two vocal selections—"Little Bit of Heaven" and "Coming in on a Wing and a Prayer."

(Victoria Daily Times, July 7, 1943.)

"The payment of subsidies distributed the burden of rising costs according to ability to pay," Mr. Ilsley said.

"Far from being a policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul, the payment of subsidies to stabilize the cost of living is sound and in the best interests of the very groups in the community on whose behalf my honorable friend so often speaks."

(Mr. Ilsley, as reported in the Globe and Mail.)

Warning that the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States anticipates a serious crime wave in the period immediately following the end of the war, Cecil L. Snyder, K.C., Deputy Attorney-General of Ontario . . . expressed the belief that this crime wave would be reflected in Canada, and he suggested that a brushing up on criminal law and procedure would place Crown attorneys in the best possible position to direct and advise law enforcement officials when their services would be urgently needed. "A violent crime wave in the United States is bound to be reflected in Canada," said Mr. Snyder.

(Globe and Mail, June 28, 1943.)

It won't be possible to overcover the Canadians because there will be more heroism and valor—and more blood and death—than all our correspondents can see or write. But if we should lose our perspective we could overwrite the story. We must realize from the start it is so big it will need no overwriting.

(Gillis Purcell, Assistant General Manager, The Canadian Press, addressing Canadian newspaper proprietors at annual luncheon, as reported by Canadian Printer & Publisher for May, 1943.)

This month's prize of six months' subscription goes to Ronald Grantham, Toronto, Ont. All contributions should contain original clipping, date and name of publication from which taken.

THE CANADIAN FORUM

Vol. XXIII, No. 271



Founded 1920

Toronto, Ontario, August, 1943

Canadian Troops in Action

Invasion of Sicily has relieved world tension and strengthened hope that the war is entering the decisive stage. It hints at the Allied grand strategy: to knock Italy out of the war by a combined military and political offensive, while continuing to prepare the way by air bombardment for penetration of the German fortress at other points.* Meantime Russia can be counted on to keep the Nazis busy on the eastern front. Initial successes in Sicily have reflected the thoroughness with which the plans were laid; and the bombing of military targets in Rome shows both the precision of our air assault and our refusal to permit the Axis to use cultural and religious centres as a shield for their operations.

Participation of the 1st Division of Canada's army in the Sicilian drive brings the war closer to Canadian bosoms. After more than three years of waiting, our ground troops are engaged on a large scale. Previous co-operation of Canadian airmen and sailors on many fronts has already given many families a personal stake in the ebb and flow of war. But now Canada will share with her allies the wider impact of sacrifice and the need for fortitude on the home front.

In view of this, Mr. King's indignation over the stupidity or indifference which withheld from Canada the knowledge that her sons were at last involved in a major battle was fully justified. It will be widely shared, not because of mere national sensitiveness, but because thousands of Canadian homes were vitally concerned and had a right to prompt information. Canada's contribution to the war effort has not been so slight that her Prime Minister should have to appeal personally to President Roosevelt before the bare fact of her troops' movements could be revealed. Nor can the continued delay in naming units and commanders be accounted for by military prudence. Subsequent reports of complimentary greetings to Canadian soldiers by General Eisenhower and General Montgomery do no compensate for this denial of elementary rights. Operations in the Mediterranean are under direction of General Eisenhower; the Canadian division forms part of General Montgomery's famous 8th Army. It is to be hoped that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill will see to it that such slights to Canada are not repeated.

"Non-Intervention" Again?

It is not too much to say that the people of the democracies were shocked by the truculent semi-official announcement from General Eisenhower's headquarters that the arrangement reached between Generals DeGaulle and Giraud through the French National Committee in North Africa was unsatisfactory, and that exclusive authority must be vested in Giraud.

Impressions of General Giraud derived from his visit to the United States and Canada have not allayed these misgivings. The meagre and restrained press reports have presented him as a soldier of the old school, distrustful of politics and averse to being interviewed. But a negative attitude towards politics does not mean that a soldier is totally without a view of life; and everything we know of General Giraud indicates that his views are not such as to inspire the confidence of genuine democrats. However much Gen-

eral Eisenhower might wish it otherwise, it is impossible to separate political from military considerations in this war. His "non-partisan" action, backed as it is by both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, will merely signify to the real anti-Axis masses in France and the other occupied countries an unpropitious interference on the side of reactionary elements. DeGaulle, whatever his personal foibles, does represent popular resistance to the Axis in a way Giraud never could. Moreover, DeGaulle's military record suggests a clearer perception of the organization and tactics needed in this war.

Are we again witnessing the kind of "non-intervention" which proved so disastrous to democratic forces in Spain? Is it possible that British and American leadership do not wish to give too much encouragement to those who see this war as a revolution which will liberate enslaved peoples from reaction in all its forms? It is this alarming thought to which recent policies in North Africa lend color.

Error of Judgment

Although the present Minister of Justice sits in the House of Commons for Quebec East, the constituency so long represented by Wilfrid Laurier and Ernest Lapointe, his speech on July 5 in moving postponement of electoral redistribution till after the war was scarcely in the tradition of a Laurier, or even a Lapointe. Sufficient reason for the postponement is found in the fact that a wartime census, reflecting the perhaps temporary migration of workers from one province to another, is not one upon which to base a redistribution involving the relative populations of the provinces. Had further reasons been needed, they were adequately suggested in a single sentence at the end of the minister's speech: "I sincerely feel that because of the predominance of French in Quebec and English elsewhere any attempt to settle at this time a permanent pattern for the proper representation of the provinces in this house might well be such an occasion [for "assertions and denials, recriminations and aspirations," etc.]"

Avowing his wish not to "provoke controversy" but merely to "indicate the kind of controversy which it seems desirable to avoid," Mr. St. Laurent saw fit to deliver a speech which was about as provocative as could well be imagined. He managed to drag in all the chief matters over which bitter controversy has raged for generations—the proportion of parliamentary seats as between Quebec and the rest of Canada; the French language; the extent of French-Canadian participation in this war; a national anthem and a national flag. So unnecessary was this, indeed, that he drew a rebuke from the Speaker for irrelevancy.

The curious fact is that Mr. St. Laurent appeared sincerely desirous of avoiding controversy. The speech, therefore, was a sheer error of judgment, and one which it is difficult to imagine either Sir Wilfrid Laurier or Ernest Lapointe delivering under the circumstances—or Mr. King approving. For whatever may be said of some of Mr. King's policies, he has been assiduous in striving for that national harmony so desirable at all times, and especially when we are at war.

This speech, and his curiously obtuse attitude towards the Communist ban, seem to show a singular lack in Mr. St. Laurent of that penetration and balance one would expect in a Minister of Justice. His pronouncement on the censorship, following the remark about judges in which Miss Agnes Macphail gave perhaps too much reign to poetic license,

*As we go to press, news comes of the fall of Mussolini and the Fascist Government, with signs of internal disturbances in Italy that seem to herald a suit for peace.

hinted at an imperfect understanding of what democracy means, and roused even the *Globe and Mail* (no lover of Miss Macphail) to an indignant defense of press freedom. His latest speech handed to the same paper an excuse for one of the most violently provocative editorials in its brief but colorful record of appeals to prejudice. It is a pity; for some of Mr. St. Laurent's qualities give grounds only for respect. But errors of judgment as serious as this can hardly be overlooked in a minister of the Crown when the need for national harmony is imperative. It is time Mr. King gently admonished his colleague against providing gastric irritants for such trouble-makers as "Canada's National Newspaper."

Missing Symbols of Unity

Not that we do not sympathize with Mr. St. Laurent's urge to deplore our lack of a national flag and anthem even while he was pointing out the danger of trying to remedy that lack at the present juncture. It is one of the ironies of Mr. King's lifelong pursuit of national unity that at the very time when, as Mr. St. Laurent so tellingly suggested, a national flag and anthem are specially desirable—when, indeed, they might have served the ends of national unity—we not only lack the one altogether, and have no common words for the other, but are prevented from getting them through fear of upsetting what national unity we have. Had Mr. King been more astute (or shall we say less timid and procrastinating) we might have had both before the war; for it is only a tiny minority of our colonial imperialists who do not want either. How inspiring it would be, for instance, if both English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians now fighting abroad could march together under a banner symbolic of their common Canadianism, and could join with equal fervor (even bi-lingually) in the words of a national anthem mutually agreed upon. Who can tell, also, whether General Eisenhower would have been so confused about whether it was necessary to distinguish Canadian soldiers from their comrades of the British 8th Army if Canada had had her own flag, giving to her sons an identity which is, in the first instance, neither English, French nor British, but Canadian?

Betrayal of a Trust

Canadians are familiar enough with the moral obliquity which will lead commercial advertisers to make the most misleading and even dangerous claims for their products if the appeal promises greater sales. This is a phenomenon inseparable from the profit-system under which we live. One expects no ethics where the guiding maxim is still "Let the buyer beware." Most of us realize this, and act accordingly—though modern advertising technique is continually swelling the legion of the happily hornswoggled. Amoralism in our "free" newspaper press is more serious, because superficial indications of it do not always suggest its deeper implications.

Yet the war has shown how feeble is the sense of public responsibility in Canadian daily newspapers. The headlining of war news by which customers are misled into believing minor achievements greater or more decisive than they are can only be ascribed to one motive—the desire to sell papers. Morning papers, it is true, have been lesser offenders—but there are only some half dozen morning papers amongst a total of more than ninety dailies in Canada, and their street-sale editions have a small market. Comparison of headlines in the street-sale editions of evening papers with headlines on the same news items in home-delivery editions will make clear how common is the practice of giving false emphasis

to dispatches and playing up unsubstantiated reports and trivial rumors in one edition, only to play them down in another, not because of later changes in the news, but because the headlines have served their purpose of stimulating street sales. It is no defense to say that this practise is comparatively harmless because the effect is fleeting. It is in reality playing fast and loose with people's hopes and sensibilities, in an atmosphere of nervous tension, with a single object—commercial gain. It shows a cynical disregard for the public, stemming from a passive partnership with commercial interests in spreading half-truths and falsehoods through the advertising by which newspapers are supported but for which they accept no responsibility. And this becomes, inevitably, an active partnership in defending, subtly or blatantly, through newshandling or comment, the system of which our newspapers are now a part.

Even those few papers which are at times critical of defects in this system follow such practices. Our biggest and most influential dailies are amongst the worst offenders. No espousal of charitable or socially desirable movements, no lip-service to the cause of the common people, can expiate this betrayal of a primary trust—to present news in its proper perspective and without false emphasis.

Election Humors in Ontario

The Ontario election campaign has not been without its humors. Premier Nixon has been warning the electors against the "new-fangled" ideas of the CCF (new-fangled to Mr. Nixon) and trying to scare the farmers by asserting that the CCF would "nationalize" the land—a point neatly disposed of by Miss Macphail, who pointed out that what the CCF is really after is the processing monopolies and mortgage companies which are keeping the farmer poor. Meanwhile, Colonel Drew was busy bundling all the socially desirable reforms that could be thought up in a hurry into an election omnibus and labelling it "Progressive-Conservative," trusting to the short memories and natural human inertia of many voters to prevent their detecting the hollow teeth which conceal the strings binding Mr. Drew to the private interests (delightfully misnamed "private initiative"). Reliable (You Bet I'm a Vet) Exterminators Reg'd has continued, in unholy but diverting alliance with the *Globe and Mail*, to assist it in seeing bugs in every bed save that of the sacred moneymakers. The woman correspondent of The Canadian Press in England has pictured the bewilderment of the proxy-privileged Canadian soldier, trying to find out what it's all about. A Communist candidate in Toronto has marshalled a corps of letter writers to heap abuse on the CCF candidate for "splitting the labor vote." But most amusing of all have been the endeavors of both the old parties to pretend that they have nothing in common, and that they are not afraid of that big bad wolf, the CCF.

Important Conference

Conferences of the Canadian Institute on Public Affairs, held at Lake Couchiching, Ontario, August 21st to 28th, grow in interest and importance. This year the theme is "The United Nations Today and Tomorrow," and speakers will include Major Bonneau of the Fighting French National Committee; Prof. Alvin H. Hansen, leading American authority on the economics of full employment; Eugene Staley; R. J. Bunche; Sir George Sansom; Brooke Claxton; Leonard Marsh and Graham Spry. We recommend it to our readers. For information write: R. E. G. Davis, 3 Willcocks Street, Toronto.

Balloting for a Better World

Editorial

► AS THE WAR nears its climax, realization grows that the common man's idea of what we are fighting for differs widely from that held by many of those in political and economic control. Leaders and people are one in their resolve to crush the Axis military power and make it impossible for the aggressor nations ever again to plunge the world into war. But there the real unity ends.

It is true that resounding lip-service is being paid by spokesmen of the United Nations to the ideal of "freedom" and "democracy." They even concede that the world which is to come out of the war must be a "better" world. But the terms are conveniently vague, and concern mainly international relations. When it comes to internal affairs, what is plainly envisaged is a return as soon as possible to the world we knew before the war. If the two "worlds"—external and internal—conflict, so much the worse for the former.

Signs abound that those who have a vested interest in the status quo at home are determined to have the old ways back. The basic self-interest of this aim is camouflaged by stressing individual initiative as the motive force of all progress, and by identifying this normal creative spirit in the human individual with a "free enterprise" economy. Insidious propaganda seeks to bolster this distorted view of human motivation. Our fighting men are depicted in cunningly-worded advertisements as aching for a return to conditions "exactly as they left them," for the opportunity after the war to live their lives unhampered by state "regimentation." In paid magazine and newspaper space, interested corporations are creating the impression that it is really private industry that is winning the war for us—that without it we should never have been able to marshal our productive resources to overcome the enemy. (How Russia has performed a much more formidable task is not mentioned).

In Canada this is happening with the full connivance of the government. Moreover, the government, under the guise of using our "best brains" for the war effort, has placed in positions of power the very men who are set on frustrating the real aspirations of the common man when his blood, toil, sweat and tears shall have brought victory. Elaborate "studies" have yielded piecemeal proposals for "reconstruction," but nothing in the way of a comprehensive post-war plan. Indeed, Mr. Howe, with revealing frankness, has expressed disbelief in planning. Speaking for his own department of Munitions and Supply, but evidently voicing government views, the Minister said: "Its purpose is to leave industry in exactly the same competitive position as at the outbreak of war." From this it is plain that any "planning" of our economic life will be left to private industry. There is no promise that even those controls under which our industrialists have worked so grudgingly in wartime will be continued for very long after the war.

On the other hand, indications are that the so-called-progressive Conservative Party will be no more favorable to a constructive national plan of production when peace comes than the present government. Mr. Bracken has made it clear that he believes private enterprise should be left free to run production on the familiar lines of monopoly, cut-throat competition, exploitation and waste—with, of course, such government aid as its own mistakes and inefficiencies make necessary. There is nothing, in fact, to differentiate

the two old parties in their attitudes towards the problem about which ordinary citizens, and especially our fighting men, are most concerned—the ordering of our national economy so that full use shall be made of our resources for the common benefit.

That is why people of all occupations are turning with hope to the CCF. It is the only party whose approach to this problem is realistic and fearless, because it recognizes that obsolete methods are not good enough for the new world that is being born out of the present upheaval.

Those who seek a return to the old ways see in this awakening of the common people a threat to their long-established privileges. Thus they are exerting every effort to misrepresent and discredit the CCF. The cruder attempts are self-defeated by the obviously self-interested sources from which they spring. The subtler ones, originating in quarters commonly regarded as objective and "liberal," illustrate anew both the fundamental unity underlying the old political divisions and the futility of expecting unbiased judgment from journals which depend for support upon our industrial and financial overlords. Foregoing for the moment the shopworn charges of "impractical idealism," "untried experiment," "state regimentation" and so on, these supposedly disinterested journals are now finding "convincing" reasons why the CCF can never hope to gain power.

Thus, an article in *Saturday Night*, commended editorially with the urbane dogmatism to which readers of that journal have been accustomed, purports to show how completely opposed are the interests of the industrial worker and the farmer in this country, and consequently how impossible it is for the CCF to construct a program which will appeal to both. The worker wants high wages and low food prices; the farmer wants high food prices and low prices for the workers' product; hence the two groups are natural and deadly enemies. Labor will use its economic power to obtain high wages (that, according to this writer, is all it is after); the farmer, having less economic power, will use his political power to obtain better prices and more profits (which, being a "capitalist," is all he is after). "If the CCF should come to power in normal times," asks the writer, "how could it manage a further rise in labor's share of the national income which would not raise costs even to the extent of setting in motion inflationary forces?" And there, in essence, the writer leaves it, on a note of triumph in having proven to his own satisfaction that this country is split incurably into two sets of economic interests which nobody can harmonize, least of all the visionary CCF. He is apparently so overjoyed at having discovered this deep cleavage in Canadian society, and the impediment it presents to the CCF, that he is not at all disturbed by an obstacle to Canadian unity which, if genuine, should give any Canadian sincerely interested in his country's welfare occasion for the gravest alarm. He suggests no way out. What has happened in the past, he asserts, is that "protests to a politician from either farm or labor groups are played off against each other and weighed according to the voting power of each group. The result is usually a compromise which wholly pleases no one, but which leaves no one wholly unsatisfied."

Apparently, then, there is no hope from the old line parties and their "politicians." Only towards the end of the article does the writer uncover a gleam of hope. "True enough," he says, "farm and labor interests have been successfully united for a long time in countries like Sweden." But it seems that something called "the Canadian climate of opinion" and Canadian economic history stand in the way of any such union in Canada.

The editor of *Saturday Night*, giving his blessing to this "analysis," adds a thought of his own. "The CCF," he declares, "is a doctrinaire Socialist party, led in the main

by Englishmen or English-trained Canadians with a good working knowledge of industrial conditions but little familiarity with the farm." He fears that the aims of union labor members as represented in the councils of the party "are not going to commend themselves much to the agriculturists, to whom they offer nothing but a much higher price level for farm products." We refrain from reviving old asperities by any allusion to Canadian journals edited by Englishmen; but apart from that, the charge that the CCF is mainly led by Englishmen or "English-trained" Canadians without knowledge of farm problems is both untrue and silly. As for being "doctrinaire," we cannot imagine anything more doctrinaire than the old parties' insistence on the virtues of "private enterprise." The final remark about labor and agriculture merely echoes the writer of the *Saturday Night* article, and is worthier of a Dr. Goebbels, whose principle has always been "divide and rule," than of a responsible Canadian editor.

If these and other such Cassandra-like forebodings about the irreconcilability of economic interests in Canada were less obviously motivated by fear of the CCF (the "liberal" *Winnipeg Free Press* has been less suave and even more illogical), they might deceive many people. But the truth to which Canadian farmers, workers, professional and business people, and even some industrialists and financiers, are awakening is that the CCF offers the only sensible proposals for removing whatever genuine sources of disharmony exist in our Canadian economy. Even more important, the CCF, however incomplete or imperfect its proposals, is the only party sincerely and disinterestedly determined to find a solution for these problems which will meet the real needs of all sections of the community.

What keeps journals like *Saturday Night* from supporting the CCF editorially is the fact that they are bound to lean towards those who provide their sustenance—that is, the big advertisers; it is precisely these who have a vested interest in the old ways. Only a few of them are clear-sighted enough to see that new methods spell a better world for all except a very few overprivileged persons, and that even these have nothing to lose but their golden chains. This is not to say that the editor of *Saturday Night* does not actually share the attitude of this minority. The point is that even if he did not, he would not be free to say so with any degree of vigor. That is one of the results of having in a country of supposedly "free" journalism, a press which advertising has rescued from political influence only to deliver it over to the real masters of our government.

Today, most people realize this, and are on their guard. Only a few of the middle-class, who are prevented by long conditioning and mental lethargy from discerning where their own interests lie, are deceived. The farmer, the factory worker, most salary-earners and the ordinary business men are beginning to understand that they are all in the same boat, and must drift or sail together. Commonsense tells them that sectional rivalries are needless; that they can be removed by full production and employment all round; that this calls for an integrated plan, since our economic well-being can no longer be left dependent upon the haphazard, wasteful, restrictive and inefficient pre-war methods; and the CCF alone proposes to initiate such a plan, and put it democratically into operation.

Because the CCF objective is not a "totalitarian" one, but involves a high degree of decentralization in accordance with our Canadian federal system, the pending general election in Ontario is of great importance. A rational economy necessarily calls for central planning; but both in the making of the plan and in its operation each Canadian province will have a part to play, and many matters will fall largely within the sphere of provincial origination and administra-

tion. The kind of lives Ontario people will live in the near future, as well as the kind of contribution Ontario makes to the war effort, will depend to a considerable extent upon the kind of government they elect on August 4th.

Of almost equal importance is the indication which the Ontario voting will give of what we are doing at home to prepare a better Canada for our fighting men to return to. It will indicate whether the majority of their homekeeping fellow citizens are content to let things go on in the same old way, or are determined now to begin remoulding our governmental machinery for the needs of a post-war world. Many of those fighting men will have no share in that decision. Upon those at home, therefore, rests a double responsibility. They will be speaking not merely for themselves, but for those they love and honor, many of whom are at this moment risking their lives for a view of life. Dare they suppose that that view envisages a return to the kind of Ontario we had before the war? Will they listen to promises glibly made by those who have so sadly failed them in the past, or will they heed the unspoken aspirations of those for whose return they pray? Will timidity and custom restrain them, or will they show by their votes that they are worthy of their fighting men—of their high courage, their devotion to principle, their adventurous vision of a better world?

C.P.R. Semantics

► AN INTERESTING item appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* for June 26th, 1943. It is a fine example of the "inspired" story which so frequently finds its way into the wealthier press as though it were a mere piece of news. It is also a rather nice example of how words can be used by publicity agents to convey an impression the exact opposite of the facts. The heading to the item reads "C.P.R. Stimulation of Industry Cited." One expects to read of great things done by the C.P.R. to aid industry. Private enterprise on the job again, obviously. It takes a little time to adjust oneself to the discovery that the "C.P.R." aid to industry consists entirely of Dominion government loans to the C.P.R.—many of them without interest. But let the item speak for itself:

Statements recently made in the House of Commons at Ottawa disclose that the Canadian Pacific Railway over the past few years has been a good client of the Dominion Government insofar as the latter has gone into the business of lending money to assist vital industries in the performance of services absolutely essential to the carrying on of the nation's business.

A "good client" indeed. The C.P.R. has "aided industry" by being on the receiving end of government loans. Note that the government is not the one to which the aid is attributed. With respect to certain loans made between 1931-1933 the item states:

The depression was then at its full height and it was necessary that something be done to check the growing unemployment. Large industrial concerns were approached with this end in view and the Canadian Pacific agreed to assist by going on with work that otherwise would have been left to more prosperous times when the company's funds were better able to take care of it. For this purpose the government advanced to the company in 1931 a total of \$1,447,221, repayable on demand without interest when the company resumes dividends at

a rate of more than 5 per cent. per annum. In 1932 and 1933 the government advanced another million dollars repayable on demand without interest before the company pays any dividend on its common stock.

The italics, needless to say, have been added. The kindness of the C.P.R. in "agreeing to assist" by taking two and a half million dollars for nothing seemed to deserve special attention. The delightful provision which requires the private investors in the C.P.R. to be receiving *more than 5%* in dividends before any obligation to pay back the money to the Canadian people accrues, also seems worthy of record. It all fits so neatly into the concept of "private enterprise" as we have learned to understand it in Canada. It is a natural precursor to Shipshaw.

And to think that the CCF was considered radical because it proposed interest-free loans as a means of financing this war!

There is more in the story, however. The total amount of the loans referred to works out as follows:

DATE	AMOUNT		INTEREST RATE
1. 1931-1933	\$1,447,221	Repayable only when dividends pass 5%	0%
2. 1931-1933	1,000,000	Callable on demand	0%
3. 1935-1936	1,270,000		0% for first 2 yrs. 4% after
4. 1935-1938	5,730,000	Hire-purchase agreement	0% for first 2 yrs. 3% after
5. 1936	554,700		2½%
6. 1939-1941	9,951,489		3½%

The total for these loans is almost \$20,000,000. The item records that total interest payments were only \$1,674,391, over the whole period. This would work out at a very modest rate per annum on the whole. Meanwhile the poor little home-owner who borrowed from the same government under Part I of the National Housing Act, also as an "aid to industry," had to pay a full 5%. And the little business man borrowing from the Bank of Montreal had to pay . . . how much?

Most of these loans, it may be noted, came from the Liberal government. To cap the story, there was an announcement a short time ago that the C.N.R., as a measure of war economy, intended to close all its summer resorts. C.P.R. resorts are not being closed. Perhaps they want to earn more than their 5% so that they can pay back the first loan.



Getting Acquainted

Tom Irving

► IN THE PAST two or three years a change has been coming over Canadian public opinion: a growing interest in Latin America has resulted in the formation of many clubs in various parts of the country. The fact that this has occurred in so many places at the same time proves that it is spontaneous, but one cannot tell whether it is an overflow from Latin-American enthusiasm in the United States, or a desire on the part of the Canadian people to depend less on Britain and the neighboring republic in the future.

The government has paralleled this movement by the establishment of legations in Brazil, Argentina, and Chile; while the same countries have their representatives in Ottawa. It has been rumoured that these are not the only Latin-American countries which would like to open relations with Canada, but the war keeps us from going ahead with any extensive plans in this line.

The largest and wealthiest of the clubs which have been formed is the Canadian Inter-American Association of Montreal. It was founded over a year ago amid great fanfare, with Gen. Escobar as president and the Hon. James MacKinnon, the minister of Trade and Commerce, as honorary president. Mr. MacKinnon made an extensive trip to South America two years ago, and is the acknowledged leader of Canadian Latinophiles for that reason.

Until recently the Association has confined most of its activities to entertaining Latin-American visitors to Montreal. There are two types interested in its activities: businessmen and professional men. A summer school has been opened this year, and applications for admission to the Spanish classes have been encouraging. The Association was also instrumental in arranging to bring the collection of Mexican paintings which was assembled by the Philadelphia Museum of Art to Canada this summer, although present plans have it not opening until July 22nd in Ottawa, and in Montreal later on. Unfortunately, it has been booked so far ahead that these appear to be the only Canadian cities it will tour during 1943.

There is another club in Montreal, the Union Culturelle des Latins d'Amérique. It has a more French and racial bias, as its name implies, and it has tried to keep English-speaking Canadians out of its membership. This is understandable, for its president is Mr. Dostaler O'Leary, whose pre-war activities included the publication of separatist propaganda, and whose brother is presently in Mexico, where he is reported to be interested in some of the extreme right-wing parties.

A third group in Montreal is called Los Amigos Canadienses de la América Latina, and has its seat in the Hotel Lasalle, where it is attempting to build up a library for the use of its members. This group is interested more in study and conversational practice, but as it was only founded this spring, it has not had much chance for self-expression.

However, the organization which shares honors with the Canadian Inter-American for being the largest in Canada is the Spanish-American Society of Winnipeg. Professor A. L. Wells of the University of Manitoba is responsible in large part for its enthusiasm and organization. Almost

single-handed he has built up the study of Spanish on the Prairies, and now his movement has branches all through the West as far as the Pacific coast.

Ottawa has its own group too, the Canada Latin America Association, of which Mr. Paul Baillargeon has been president. It started as an offshoot of O'Leary's movement, but soon included both French and English-speaking members. However, it has suffered because it has had to break with the Union Culturelle on the racial question, and because the Canadian Inter-American Association has attracted all the big names of the capital into its honorary committee.

Last March, the Union Culturelle called a congress in Montreal which it named the Journées Pan-Latines. Here Mr. O'Leary brought up the idea of a completely "Latin" federation including groups from Quebec City, Three Rivers and Ottawa, and from which "Anglo-Saxons" would be excluded. The Canada Latin America Association delegates led by Mr. Marcel Roussin felt they could not agree to this plan since it would ban an important part of their own membership, so, supported by delegates from Winnipeg, they countered with the proposal of a coast-to-coast federation. A committee was set up to sound out popular feeling, and it has met since in Ottawa.

As a result of this, it is proposed to hold a convention in Ottawa this fall to discuss the possibility of federating the various groups across Canada. The idea behind this federation is to attend to the semi-official reception and entertainment of Latin-American visitors who may want to tour Canada away from the capital; and to pass exhibitions of paintings and of other educational material from city to city. Plans are still in a formative stage, but enquiries have revealed that there is considerable interest even in those places which have not been mentioned, such as university centres as in Kingston, Toronto, or Halifax, or on the part of scattered individuals elsewhere.

It is an urgent war need to convince the South-American countries that small nations like Canada are also fighting this war alongside larger powers. The average Latin American is a trifle afraid of the United States or Britain because they are so large; but if we could show them our effort, they might get some ideas on how they can contribute to the common cause. We have a splendid opportunity to do this with the many newspapermen who have visited us recently from South and Central America, and also with the important officials who are making state visits to this country.

The Wartime Information Board has been aware of this, and is doing a fine job of showing these visitors around the country. It is also feeling its way in distributing news and information about Canada down south. However, this sort of propaganda will require a larger appropriation, especially if it is to include films and exhibits. Besides, it is rather anomalous that our only Information offices "abroad" should be in the United States.

If some consistent policy could be worked out to couple the growing local enthusiasms in Canadian cities to a vigorous propaganda campaign abroad, who knows where it might lead. Canada has suffered in the past from being tied too closely to one or two countries, and it is in our interest to put out feelers in other directions. More and more Canadians are beginning to realize the importance of foreign relations in Canada's post-war economy, and it is foresighted to penetrate those areas which are open and friendly to us now. It will be doubly important, for our trade on one hand, and for collective security on the other. Who knows

but that at the present time we are watching Canada come of age, not just as a fighting power, but as a factor for peace? Her importance after the war will depend largely on what friendships she can form now, and how intelligently and sincerely she can cultivate them.

A Discussion on Housing

J. F. C. Smith

► AN EXCELLENT and very significant pamphlet* on housing in Canada has just come off the press.

More an outline of the needs and problems involved than a study of the organizational set-up required to initiate and execute a comprehensive housing program, its primary appeal is directed to the public. That is not to say that others will not be interested. Architects, sociologists, economists and students will find much information between its covers to round out their experience or fill gaps in their knowledge.

Presentation is divided into three parts, the first being a report of the views expressed by six authorities invited to address a housing conference held in Toronto by the Ontario Association of Architects last February; the second a speech at the annual dinner of the Association by Catherine Bauer, famous American expert who attended the conference, on the methods employed in the United States to meet conditions similar to those in Canada; and the third a summation, in the form of questions and answers, of various aspects of the housing problem. The whole has been skilfully woven together by the editor, Anthony Adamson, described as "a graduate of Cambridge University and of several sanatoriums," and brightly illustrated by Dacre Boulton.

The first speaker at the conference, Professor E. R. Arthur, presented the town planning need. Mentioning that Canadians had in the past exploited their land with wanton unconcern, he deplored the fallacy of regarding houses as individual entities self-sufficient in themselves. "We must look to a future in terms of city blocks and suburban areas in acres planned not only in blocks, zones and municipalities but in counties and regions." He took exception to the popular belief that chopping an urban centre into industrial, residential and commercial sections was desirable and, pointing out the slow deterioration of each rigid lifeless district, stressed the need for overall planning on a really adequate scale.

Speaking of the modern conception of housing as planning in neighborhood units, Professor Arthur reminded his hearers that these units—each with its own educational, commercial and possibly occupational focus—entail municipal ownership or at least control of land. In this regard, the British Uthwatt Report had provided a lead applicable to Canada. Obviously legislation would be necessary here if regional and community plans are to be implemented by means of expropriation and compensation.

He and Captain Humphrey Carver had prepared a tentative scheme assigning responsibility for planned housing among the federal, provincial and municipal governments. Under the scheme the Dominion Government would initiate the whole program, establish standards, provide finance and publicity. The province would locate the various projects on a broad, regional basis, enact required housing and slum clearance legislation, and authorize essential amendments to the property tax structure. It would then be the duty of

*HOMES OR HOVELS?: Some Authoritative Views on Canadian Housing. Ed. Anthony Adamson; Canadian Association for Adult Education and Canadian Institute of International Affairs 1943; pp. 48; 10c.

each municipality to survey its housing conditions and needs, secure sites in accordance with a pre-determined plan of development, and administer the estates built.

Professor Arthur neatly disposed of the bogey that in building decent dwellings for the 60% of the population who cannot afford them without public subsidy bureaucratic controls would be set up which would ruin the private builder. He stated that private building has actually greatly increased in countries where public housing had been undertaken. Expressing sympathy for the small contractor, earning his livelihood by the perpetuation of such inadequate accommodation as the majority of the people now endure, he declared that town planning was needed from a practical business viewpoint. "The loan companies and the National Housing Administration know that a 20-year amortization period does not represent the life of a house but of the unplanned district. Given planned neighborhoods the period of amortization could be increased to 40 years with a reduction in costs to home-owner and renter, and with the provision of the proper amenities of civic life."

Alderman the Reverend John Frank laid emphasis on the social need for better housing. Drawing attention to the escapist tendencies of those persons whose living conditions were "ugly and filthy, bleak and cramped" he claimed that too many responsible members of democratic states are content to accept primitive standards of housing as sufficient for far too many of their fellow-citizens.

An astonishing amount of congestion exists in small communities and rural districts as well as urban areas, with social implications of terrifying proportions. "Here are disease centres, and from them the infection spreads. Efforts at treatment are made in an ever-increasing number of child and social welfare agencies, in family and juvenile courts, in penal institutions and asylums, and in the maintenance of a large police force and fire brigade." Alderman Frank boldly denied that most of the occupants of unsanitary and obsolete dwellings were so stupid as to not appreciate an upward revision in housing standards. He said, "Their intelligence is given no chance to express itself constructively, such is their unending struggle for existence."

Mr. A. J. B. Gray, Ontario's Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, spoke as a private citizen. Drawing upon his experience in supervising and advising nearly one thousand municipalities, he acknowledged a great need for housing but felt that even more essential was a definite delegation of responsibility with regard to it. "I do not share the view that housing should be a municipal responsibility," he stated. "It is a federal one, and I believe the municipality should only co-operate with other governments to implement a national scheme." He agreed with Professor Arthur's suggestion that the three governments, Dominion, Provincial and Municipal should combine their efforts in the direction of planning, with housing as one of the chief objectives. In the past, millions of dollars had been spent on improvements which, under any real planning authority, could have been used with far greater economy and to far better purpose.

To Mr. Gray's way of thinking, much is yet to be done towards bringing about reduced taxation of land though in Ontario a decrease of about 15% had been noted over the past eleven years. "If we hope to maintain our municipalities in a sound financial condition, all we should expect from them is that they will co-operate with us (the provincial government) in making land available wherever the authority whose task it is to bring down the plan for that municipality decides to locate the housing project. I believe also," he concluded, "that we should have a reasonable plan for the whole area, because I cannot see how we can attempt to plan for such a city as Toronto alone, without including an area possibly ten or twelve miles out."

The President of the National Construction Council, Mr. A. S. Mathers, was the next speaker. In his opening remarks he pointed out that the construction industry accounted for roughly one-fifth of all persons gainfully employed in Canada exclusive of agriculture. Large-scale housing developments are essential if this group is to be assured of post-war employment. "Industrial building will not bulk largely nor is it thought that commercial building will be in much demand, except as a secondary result of a period of continued general employment." He made it quite clear that under the present system of financing and building houses, no low-cost, low-rental schemes could be expected.

The factors which accounted for the reluctance of capital to seek housing as an investment were summarized by Mr. Mathers as neighborhood instability due to lack of planning and too small-scale operations, exorbitant municipal taxation for services unconnected with property, and the rapid rate of obsolescence of structures that had been ineptly designed. He struck a challenging note with an assertion that the construction industry "labors under the unique distinction of being the producer of the only product made by man, ownership of which involves its purchaser in a continual and unequal struggle with the state for its possession. This injustice," he went on, "must be removed if the housing problem is ever to be solved." The forecast was made that in future the design of housing would be improved, possibly in the evolution of a new aesthetic form divorced from the traditional handicraft technique.

Mr. Alfred Ward, representing labor, contested the claim that the proper organization of building tradesmen and payment of fair wages would further increase construction costs. Instead, by reason of efficient planning and large-scale operations it was likely that the price per dwelling-unit would remain constant. At present workers in the building industry have the highest hourly but the second lowest annual wage rate. The well-known inability of the average citizen to accumulate savings to meet emergencies, or even major needs, had led the majority of working people to be "overwhelmingly in favor of large-scale housing projects, ordered and planned to conform with the most up-to-date knowledge gained by scientific research and practical experience in town-planning."

In the past the dwellings supplied by private enterprise by "the uniformity, the smallness of the lots, the absolute lack of provision for recreational facilities, transportation, and other public services, all lead us to the conclusion that planning for the good and welfare of a community had been a very secondary thought." As well the houses were of poor design, built with cheap labor at high cost. Mr. Ward was convinced that three lines of attack would aid in solving the housing problem. While present residential districts should be gradually torn down and replaced, new garden suburbs might be developed on the outskirts and simultaneously complete new modern towns could be erected on new town sites. Much needed employment would be provided while the standard of our dwelling accommodation would be raised.

Captain Rodney Adamson, M.P., brought the political searchlight to bear on the question of housing. He deplored the fact that vast numbers of people take little interest in their country and, in evaluating political technique, stated that one way to ensure success with the electorate was to get them to vote against something. He cautioned that "when you are dealing with a subject as vitally important as housing but as technically difficult to grasp by the ordinary individual, you must take great care that people don't vote 'against' housing." What appalled Captain Adamson was the fact that so many persons living in the most miserable quarters did not realize that this was not the way in which

they should or need be housed. He suggested that if they could be convinced that with the co-ordination of enabling legislation, taxation relief, expert planning and large-scale projects they can be given modest but clean, new and efficient houses, then they will vote against the old "homes" that are not homes at all.

While there was no direct reference to the matter, several speakers seemed aware that the provision of better dwellings was not in itself enough. Obviously a certain standard of economic security must be maintained: people plagued by uncertain and unremunerative employment would be unable to pay even a low rent for decent housing. To attempt a really adequate program within the pre-war framework of free enterprise, now represented to us as the ideal model by those interested in the conservation and extension of the power, wealth and prestige of our economic overlords, is to condemn it to failure. To anyone presuming to judge capitalism by its works rather than its theories, it is apparent that a planned economy with all the agencies of production, distribution and consumption operated for the nation as a whole must of necessity take the place of the chaotic, irresponsible exploitation of natural and human resources which have so far characterized the profits-at-any-price system. Only in this way can minimum security for all classes and walks of life, so necessary a corollary of any real housing program, be guaranteed.

Autobiography

I

Out of the ghetto streets where a Jewboy
Dreamed pavement into pleasant bible-land,
Out of the Yiddish slums where childhood met
The friendly beard, the loutish Sabbath-goy,
Or followed, proud, the Torah-escorting band,
Out of the jargonizing city I regret,
Rise memories, like sparrows rising from
The gutter-scattered oats,
Like sadness sweet of synagogal hum,
Like Hebrew violins
Sobbing delight upon their eastern notes.

II

Again they ring their little bells, those doors
Deemed by the tender-year'd, magnificent:
Old Ashkenazi's cellar, sharp with spice;
The widows' double-parlored candy-stores
And nuggets sweet bought for one sweaty cent;
The warm fresh-smelling bakery, its pies,
Its cakes, its navel'd bellies of black bread;
The lintels candy-poled
Of barber-shop, bright-bottled, green, blue, red;
And fruit-stall piled, exotic,
And the big synagogue door, with letters of gold.

III

Again my kindergarten home is full—
Saturday night—with kin and compatriot:
My brothers playing Russian card-games; my
Mirroring sisters looking beautiful,
Humming the evening's imminent fox-trot;
My uncle Mayer, of blessed memory,
Still murmuring Maariv, counting holy words;
And the two strangers, come
Fiery from Volhynia's murderous hordes—
The cards and humming stop.
And I too swear revenge for that pogrom.

IV

Occasions dear: the four-legged aleph named
And angel pennies dropping on my book;
The rabbi patting a coming scholar-head;
My mother, blessing candles, Sabbath-flamed,
Queenly in her Warsawian perruque;
My father pickabacking me to bed
To tell tall tales about the Baal Shem Tov,—
Letting me curl his beard.
O memory of unsurpassing love,
Love leading a brave child
Through childhood's ogred corridors, unfear'd!

V

The week in the country at my brother's—(May
He own fat cattle in the fields of heaven!)
Its picking of strawberries from grassy ditch,
Its odour of dogrose and of yellowing hay,—
Dusty, adventurous, sunny days, all seven!—
Still follow me, still warm me, still are rich
With the cow-tinkling peace of pastureland.
The meadow'd memory
Is sodded with its clover, and is spanned
By that same pillow'd sky
A boy on his back one day watched enviously.

VI

And paved again the street: the shouting boys
Oblivious of mothers on the stoops
Playing the robust robbers and police,
The corn-cob battle,—all high-spirited noise
Competitive among the lot-drawn groups.
Another day, of shaken apple-trees
In the rich suburbs, and a furious dog,
And guilty boys in flight;
Hazelnut games, and games in the synagogue,—
The burrs, the Haman rattle,
The Torah-dance on Simchas-Torah night.

VII

Immortal days of the picture-calendar
Dear to me always with the virgin joy
Of the first flowering of senses five,
Discovering birds, or textures, or a star,
Or tastes sweet, sour, acid, those that cloy;
And perfumes. Never was I more alive.
All days thereafter are a dying-off,
A wandering away
From home and the familiar. The years doff
Their innocence.
No other day is ever like that day.

VIII

I am no old man fatuously intent
On memoirs, but in memory I seek
The strength and vividness of nonage days,
Not tranquil recollection of event.
It is a fabled city that I seek;
It stands in Space's vapors and Time's haze;
Thence comes my sadness in remembered joy
Constrictive of the throat;
Thence do I hear, as heard by a Jewboy
The Hebrew violins,
Delighting in the sobbed oriental note.

A. M. Klein

PLANNING POST-WAR CANADA

A Special Section of THE CANADIAN FORUM

August, 1943

The Case for Individual Enterprise

J. M. Macdonnell

► NO MAN in his senses is opposed to planning. We would as soon expect Montgomery to attack the Mareth Line without a plan as expect success in our ordinary affairs without foresight and preparation. The only question is whether planning is to be done by the many (with whatever control by the state is necessary) or by a few, as contemplated in the Fully Planned Economy. Let us be clear as to the exact meaning of the "Fully Planned Economy." Let us describe it in plain, intelligible words. It means this: that a few people assume to have the superhuman wisdom to decide what the rest of us are to produce and consume. Having decided, they then proceed to enforce their decisions by the power of the state. No one need have any doubt that this and nothing else but this is what full planning means. At the present moment we are having, necessarily and by reason of war conditions, a fairly complete preview of it through the enormous extension of government activities in wartime. Would we like to live permanently in such a maze of rules, regulations and red tape?

With planning, of course, goes absolute power. Not only must the planning board decide what is to be done; it must see that its orders are carried out. Everyone must obey. Further, it must decide what is not to be done. There must be controls.

It is clear then that planning means obeying—planning by the few, obeying by the many. It means a few individuals who plan and give orders and a whole population who obey. Moreover, complete authority in one department of life implies the extension of that authority to other departments. Other freedoms cannot persist if freedom of initiative—economic freedom—is lost.

And let no one imagine that the lesson of our war effort is that the planning board controlling which we now have are the secret of our large production. True, in order to concentrate our effort on the war we have to resort to regimentation of various kinds. Even in peacetime we demand of government various controls of health, as in the case of epidemics, and indeed in more normal matters of health also; controls of the malice of nature—grasshoppers, boll-weevils, etc., etc. Moreover, we realize the necessity of government controls of such natural monopolies as water—to regulate levels and flow, etc. In these and other innumerable cases there is room for useful control. But observe that in all these cases no question of production is involved. We cannot create a drop of water. We can only control what nature provides. Broadly speaking we may say that controls produce nothing.

And so, returning to the war, we may properly conclude, while fully recognizing the part played by controls, that our present war production is based on the energy, the initiative, the thrift, the industry built up by an economy in which individual enterprise prevailed. It is these qualities which are now being made use of by government, as witnessed by

the fact that the men in charge of the war effort at Ottawa are nearly all business leaders.

To say this is not to suggest that everything must be done by individual enterprise and nothing by the state. The best commentary on this was made by Lyttleton, one of the members of the British Cabinet, who, on being asked whether he thought that after the war we should have more state enterprise or more individual enterprise, said he thought we should have a lot more of both.

I am confident that the regimented economy is entirely contrary to our Anglo-Saxon genius, whatever may be the case in other countries. Lord Acton wrote many years ago: "All power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." What has happened in the last twenty years has added tremendous emphasis to this warning by presenting to us the experience of the Fascist states. The bitter experience of the 1930's tended to blind men to this lesson. Not long ago I said to a trade unionist friend of mine: "Surely, you realize that Socialism means an authoritarian regime and that, as elsewhere in the world, such a regime would inevitably destroy the trade union movement." His answer was: "I'll take a chance on any government which will promise to prevent a recurrence of what happened in the 1930's." It is clear from this that those who believe in individual enterprise should spare no effort to state their case—too often they have allowed criticism to go unchallenged and failed to discharge the onus resting on them.

What is this onus? In a word it is to demonstrate that individual enterprise is not something for the benefit of a privileged few but for the benefit of all. No decent man, especially in these days when the whole fabric of society depends on the unlimited readiness of all to serve and sacrifice, would deliberately champion a system for the exclusive benefit of the few, but the champions of individual enterprise have talked little and badly in its defence and there is much lost ground to make up. It is high time that the issue should be fairly joined and every effort made to remove the prejudices and misconceptions which have got abroad. The first of these is the use of the phrase "profit system," which is constantly employed as if it were the chief characteristic, the "be all and end all" of individual enterprise.

The phrase "profit system" suggests the picture of a man taking toll of the community without adequate service to the community in return. It may be stated at the outset that the motive of most business men is not primarily profit but to run a successful business, which means to produce and distribute goods, efficiently. One of the most successful business men I ever knew said and believed, and, so far as his own experience was concerned, proved, that if a man did his own business well enough, if he maintained strict fidelity to product, profits would take care of themselves. His case is not exceptional. The true criterion of success for the real producer is the conquest of the technical and business problems of the task. As Geoffrey Crowther points out in the Economist, it would be fairer to call the system "avoidance of loss" system, for few men would cease production merely because there is no profit. Nor do those who sneer at the profit system take into account all those whose experience is not profit but loss—those who lose their all in the business production. The phrase "individual enterprise" describes

what we have in mind. It suggests the qualities which are the mainspring of all successful economic effort.

While, as I have said, profit is not the beginning and the end of the system of individual enterprise, nevertheless it is an important part of it, and it is necessary to meet head-on and put to flight the idea that profit is anti-social. This idea will not stand examination for a moment. When a small contractor does a job for us I doubt if a single one of us finds anything sordid or unsocial in his making a profit. No one complains when the great surgeon or actor or engineer receives large fees for the skill which it has taken years of effort to develop. For the same reason we do not complain if the farmer or fisherman makes a profit. We recognize here the necessity and the benefit of hardy individualism and we know that to carry on the farmer and the fisherman must be able to make a profit in order to stay in business. Granted that in large unit production the conditions are different and that there are difficulties to be overcome, nevertheless there is the same need, indeed a greater need, for the driving force of individual enterprise.

On this point of profit A. D. Lindsay, Master of Balliol College, Oxford, and a distinguished Leftist thinker and teacher, in his book "Christianity and Economics," says: "If we consider profit in itself it does not seem clear why a man working for an assured salary is doing right while a man working for an uncertain profit is doing wrong." And again he says: "So long as there is an element of uncertainty in the supplying of demands there must be profit." Our own commonsense tells us the same thing. Moreover, profit is a necessary and inescapable test of and check on the efficiency of the organization which is producing any particular product. Production by government agencies lacks this acid test of its efficiency which every individual producer has to face. In government production, with its ability to call for virtually unlimited financial support, inefficiency can escape detection in a way which is impossible under individual enterprise.

Much of the confusion of mind on this question of profit is due to the idea that the production of the country is in the hands of a few "big shots." It will be a surprise to many to know that in 1939 there were more than 25,000 separate organizations in Canada in the field of manufacturing alone—3,000 more than fifteen years earlier. Only 172 of these employed more than 500 men, and the total employed by these 172 concerns was 169,000—less than 1,000 apiece. The average number of employees of the 25,000 was 30 each. Here we have 25,000 organizations planning, devising, producing and, of course, supplying employment.

So much for profit. In the second place we must also firmly controvert the idea that competition is a sinister, unsocial thing—an idea sedulously circulated and creating widespread misunderstanding. On this point Lindsay points out that to say "surely we should prefer co-operation to competition" really answers nothing. And again he says: "If co-operation means that we must all keep in step, all advance at the same rate, all hang together, I cannot see that it is preferable." And again: "If we really believe in freedom and responsibility we must believe in a system which allows competition." Of course this implies real and not make-believe competition. The London *Economist* of December 12, 1942, says: "Enterprise must be enterprise. The role of State policy in the future is not to eliminate competition and initiative by rigid planning but to restore real enterprise by putting an end to the false and restrictive variety which already before the war was producing an ossified and unadaptable economy."

In the third place we must do our utmost to remove the false idea that the wealth of the community is a fixed and static thing and that what one man gets is taken from an-

Mr. Macdonnell is president of the National Trust Company and one of the prominent participants in the Port Hope Conference of Conservatives which preceded the Winnipeg convention at which Mr. Bracken was chosen leader and the party re-named Progressive Conservative. Mr. Scott is a member of the faculty of law at McGill University and national chairman of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF).

other. The case of a man like Edison should in itself be a sufficient refutation of this idea. Under the individualist system Edison was able to create vast wealth for others. In doing so he became wealthy himself, but what he received was a tiny fraction of what he created for others. Moreover what he himself received was the means of continuing his work on research and thus continuing to add constantly to the riches he created for others.

I have referred in a very inadequate manner to some of the economic arguments in favor of a maximum of individual enterprise. In doing so I have admitted that there will be need for more state enterprise, as Lyttleton said, and that there will, temporarily at any rate, be need for more control than before the war.

I wish now to say a word about the political arguments for individual enterprise. To me they are even stronger than the economic ones. I said earlier that with the loss of economic freedom political freedom would go too. This is a vital point, because there is abroad a loose idea that somehow the Socialist state, notwithstanding that authority is its very essence, will be democratic. To me this just doesn't add up. But I prefer not to put forward my own opinions further. I shall quote from leading Socialists. Mrs. Sidney Webb, that great pioneer of British Socialism and herself by nature a great authoritarian, was quoted as expressing the view that a democracy needs only one party. Can anyone doubt, after the spectacle of Germany and Italy, that one party inevitably means tyranny? Again, G. H. D. Cole in "What Karl Marx Really Meant," after pointing out that it is quite impracticable to continue the parliamentary system "when the rival policies differ in fundamentals," goes on to say:

It is on this ground that Marx rests his theory of the State, and his rejection of ordinary parliamentary action as the means of effecting transition from Capitalism to Socialism. . . . The question then is whether a movement of this sort (i.e. Socialist) must begin as a revolution, or can begin as a constitutional assumption of political power, and then take on a revolutionary character in the actual process of carrying it into effect. The Communist view is that it must begin as well as develop, as a revolutionary movement. . . . The opposing "left wing" Socialist view is that, in the countries equipped with powerful parliamentary institutions, it can and should begin as a constitutional movement, and thereafter develop into a revolution under the aegis of its constitutional authority.

Well, there it is, if anyone has doubts left I suggest a perusal of Cole's book will remove them.

And so it comes back to freedom—do we want it or not? Don't let us be led away with the twaddle which says we really haven't any freedom now. True, it is imperfect, but there is really a difference between having and not having an authoritative body which proposes to deal with the whole of our lives and which will have to use the necessary instruments of power in order to do so.

There remains the challenge to individual enterprise implied in the remarks of my trade unionist friend who said he would vote for anyone who would promise to prevent a recurrence of the 1930's. He was in effect saying: "Unless you who believe in individual enterprise can do a better job than you did in the 1930's it's not good enough." I think this is a natural challenge and I take it up.

Individual enterprise in the 1930's was trying to operate in a world half-maddened with fear and given over to feverish preparation for new wars. This situation inevitably produced extreme isolationism, with the equally inevitable result that things went from bad to worse. The resulting economic malady affected virtually the whole world whatever its form of economic organization. The problems were so overwhelming and unprecedented, the tempo so fast, and the increasing grip of isolationism so deadly that each attempt to alleviate the situation was too late and foredoomed to failure before it had a chance to get under way.

We are justified in hoping that we shall emerge into a saner world. But I should be very unhappy if that were my complete answer because it would imply that individual enterprise—business—while desiring the maximum of freedom is not ready to assume corresponding responsibility. Happily I am in no such difficulty, for evidence abounds that business is recognizing new and greater responsibilities in the crucial matter of providing jobs and going forward resolutely and confidently to discharge them. To give important illustrations—in the United States there is the work of the Committee for Economic Development and the Fortune Group, and in England the report of Lever Bros. entitled "The Problem of Unemployment." In passing let me emphasize the fact, which I think encouraging, that all these, while stressing the need for individual enterprise and fully realizing that it must accept heavy responsibility for providing employment, nevertheless also fully recognize that governments must operate in a stand-by capacity when periods of slackness threaten. Two short quotations will show the attitude of leading business men. Paul G. Hoffman, Chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, writes: "The members of the Committee . . . are convinced . . . that the most Commerce and Industry can do now to assure returning soldiers and workers presently engaged in war industries that peacetime jobs will be available is the least which must be done if enterprise and labor are to enjoy a free society." Lewis H. Brown, of Johns-Manville, says: "If we expect our economic or social system to prevail we must not let factories stand idle and great masses of men go unemployed. Our job is to produce in peace as well as in war. Economic systems in the future, as well as in the past, will stand or fall by their ability to produce results."

Business — individual enterprise — is accepting the onus and facing its task. With co-operation and goodwill — even a moderate portion of what we have now in wartime — we can look forward to the results with confidence.

The Case for Public Enterprise

J. R. Scott

▶ PRIVATE ENTERPRISE versus public enterprise is the issue Mr. Macdonnell and I are debating. I have the advantage of being able to write after seeing his manuscript; by the rules of the game he should be given the chance of a rebuttal in a later issue of the *Forum*. But the reader will benefit if I deal with his material in the order he has chosen.

Mr. Macdonnell and I agree that there should be planning. So far so good. He says the question is whether planning is to be done by the many or the few. He wants it done by the many. So, of course, do I. He says that planning by the few is "contemplated in the Fully Planned

Economy." In that case I reject the Fully Planned Economy. The planning I contemplate is a planning in which the people as a whole, through their democratic organizations, play the leading part. Planning by the few for the few is what we have under monopoly capitalism. We have too much of it already.

The sudden fondness of the business interests of Canada for freedom and personal liberty, when for years they have fought trade unions, co-operatives, and the democratically organized CCF party, is not surprising. The men (and I will not include Mr. Macdonnell in this group, though he speaks their language) who have opposed every democratic advance in Canada for decades are now finding an increasing opposition to their privileged position. They have suffered two major set-backs in fifteen years. First came the great depression of the 1930's, which showed that with all their skill and experience they were completely ignorant of the economic system they were operating. Then came the war and the introduction of some degree of social planning, which has incontestably proved that so soon as we abandon capitalist methods we become vastly more efficient. The national income is now three times as large as ten years ago. Instead of unemployment we have a shortage of labor. We can afford to keep 750,000 of our ablest men and women out of productive work and provide them with food, clothing and salaries. How is this possible? Because public enterprise, called the "war effort," has invaded certain fields formerly left to private enterprise. The private banks are now adjuncts of the Department of Finance. Investment is controlled by the state. Raw materials are distributed where they are needed, not to whoever can pay most for them. Prices are set by law, not by the open market. Imports and exports are impossible without a government license. Mr. Howe, who is certainly no socialist, tells us that the government-owned plants are the most efficient in the country.

So "private enterprise" turns out to be more than superfluous. It is a positive obstacle to progress. It is the costliest luxury in the country, fully as much a load on our backs as was the feudal aristocracy of Europe before the industrial revolution. In time of war, when our very existence is at stake, we have sense enough to recognize the fact and to lay individualism aside for a time. Mr. Macdonnell and his friends will bring it right back if we give them a chance.

To overcome this double setback, the two clear lessons of the depression and the war, the privileged few have now decided to adopt the language of democracy. They speak for "freedom" against "dictatorship"—having killed the one and created the other. No doubt many of them, like Mr. Macdonnell, sincerely believe in the words they use. But the record speaks for itself. Calling the Shipshaw deal "free enterprise" won't fool any more people than are fooled by the new term "Progressive-Conservative." Free or individual enterprise is the present name for monopoly capitalism. A hundred years ago the phrase had some meaning; large-scale production had not yet begun. But even before the war monopoly and imperfect competition were the rule, and individual enterprise the exception. Has Mr. Macdonnell forgotten that his own leader, then Mr. Bennett, announced in 1933 that "there is no more open market"? Has he forgotten the evidence of the Price Spreads Report of 1935, which showed the growth of monopoly in Canada? Can he honestly doubt the power of the "big shots" when, in 1935, the assets of only 67 financial corporations amounted to over seven billion dollars, and of 196 industrial and trading corporations to over six billions, and when on top of this the directors of these corporations were in many cases the same people? His figures of the 25,000 separate organizations mean

almost nothing, since 24,900 of these are dominated at every turn by the big fellows. The war has greatly increased the hold of monopoly over Canada.

What does Mr. Macdonnell mean when he says "We cannot create a drop of water," and that in the case of government controls "no question of production is involved"? Does he not know that over 80% of the new production of war material since the war comes out of government owned or controlled factories? Are we not "creating" ships and shells and planes and airports and a thousand other products out of government plants? Right under Mr. Macdonnell's nose are fine examples of state production which is efficient, accurate and essential to winning the war. It is no harder to build workers' houses than to build ships, no harder to provide shelter, food, clothing and income to men who are sick, aged or unemployed than to men who are in the unproductive (in the economic sense) work of fighting battles. We can, through public enterprise, achieve every goal the Canadian socialists have been setting themselves. This war has proven the possibility.

It is no answer to say that the government plants and Crown companies are staffed by men loaned by private business. So will be the government plants in the planned society. Private enterprise has produced technical skill; no one denies that fact. Private enterprise can never produce plenty for all, because it is not primarily interested in so doing. It is interested in maximum profit first. If to get profit it must produce scarcity, it will produce scarcity in the future as it has always done in the past—by burning coffee and dumping milk if need be.

Here let us deal with this question of profit. Mr. Macdonnell says that the motive of most business men is not profit but "to produce and distribute goods, efficiently." How does he measure efficiency? Maybe he differs from his kind, but the making of money is the supreme test of efficiency under private enterprise. The agricultural implement industry in Canada kept its price of farm machinery almost level when the price of wheat had dropped to rock bottom; result, more income to the industry but unemployment among its workers and no machinery on the farms. The beautifully efficient aluminum industry in Canada is charging the Allied governments a price for aluminum which was set by the international cartel (with the German firm participating) in 1931. Meanwhile the cost of making aluminum has fallen greatly, particularly in Canada. Allied taxpayers are being squeezed harder to keep the profits of this efficient monopoly at their present fantastic level. (The Mellon interests have been drawing 282% per annum from this little venture.) Mr. Macdonnell quotes A. D. Lindsay who says that "So long as there is an element of uncertainty in the supplying of demands there must be profit." This, if true, means that when the uncertainty goes the profit should go. How then justify giving the Bell Telephone Co. a monopoly position, which removes risk, and allowing it a cool 8% when the little buyer of war bonds gets 3%? How justify any profit to war industries when they know in advance that the government will buy everything they can produce?

No planner says profit is anti-social. He says instead that money profit is not the true motive of industry; the purpose of an economic system is first to supply what society needs. No profit system would ever give us schools or modern highways—or an army to protect our civilization. We just make up our minds we are going to have these, and we get them. So if we make up our minds we want social security and houses and hospitals we shall get them too, by the same public enterprise methods. What private corporation is ever going to supply low-income groups with houses? What corporation will ever clear away slums? Will

private enterprise give us minimum wages at a decent level, or place milk before school children?

Under the planned society the individual will have far more chance to show his private enterprise than today, in every way that helps society. He will first of all increase his personal income if he works hard and shows ability, up to the level set for the highest paid salary. He will be shown public recognition and approval. He will be placed in positions of influence. He will have the truest satisfaction of all—that of knowing he has helped his fellow man and advanced the cause of democracy. No decent human being needs greater incentives than these. The fact that he cannot corner a market or fix an exorbitant price will not wither his soul.

All through Mr. Macdonnell's analysis there appears an imaginary picture of planning as being done by a few powerful men who issue orders everyone must obey. This is just an inner picture of the business world as Mr. Macdonnell has known it. Of course this kind of planning is fascist. It is not the only nor the most efficient kind of planning, but I solemnly believe that it is what we shall get if the progressively conservative liberals of this country are not removed from office. Because no one, not even Mr. Macdonnell, has the slightest intention of trying to go back to a society of really free competition and really open markets. The only choice is between fascist planning (or Communist dictatorship-of-the-proletariat planning, which is better but not good enough) and democratic Socialist planning. In the latter the people are in control. They choose the leaders of the party which, by regular elections, comes to power. They have their trade union and farmer and co-operative representatives on all the control boards, to see that the plans when made conform to popular wishes. In every factory there are works councils where labor, management and technical men discuss the quotas of production. Towns and municipalities, provinces and the federal government, work out needed developments in their respective fields. Everybody has some part to pay in the process—not, as under private enterprise, just the top managers and executives. The ultimate decisions are in an executive responsible to a democratic parliament. There is no mystery about it; it can be seen working in New Zealand today on a smaller scale, and even in Soviet Russia there is much more general participation in planning than most people think. All that we need to achieve this kind of planning is imagination, determination, and co-operation on the political front between the three great classes of the population who stand to gain from the change—workers, farmers, and the middle class. This alone will save us. This, I believe, is coming.

Finally, I should like to answer Mr. Macdonnell's erroneous argument that under planning a few people would have to possess "the super-human wisdom to decide what the rest of us are to produce and consume." Given a good statistical service and freedom of consumer choice, both of which are available, there is little difficulty in deciding what people want to have. On this point the National Survey of Potential Productive Capacity in the United States (1934) says:

Strange as it may seem, it is easier to determine human needs than it is to determine the ability of society to extract raw materials. On the average, people of a given culture eat only so much food, wear only so many clothes, live in only so many rooms. If "scarcity values" (of works of art, etc.) are excluded from consideration—and they naturally fall outside the scope of our study since our concern was with physical quantities—the amount of goods and services the population would like to consume can be calculated with an accuracy far greater than the accuracy with which we can determine the possible output of any industry.

Let us stop being frightened by bogies and start now on the road which will lead to greater freedom and security than we have ever known.

A Step Towards the Economic Goal

Frederick Bell

► TIME AND TIME again the vital necessity for complete co-operation of all Allied units fighting in the present struggle has been emphasized. In this particular instance co-operation is dictated by stern demand. It is a matter of presenting an impregnable front to an enemy who is ever on the alert for cracks in our armor. The display of the co-operative spirit, on the other hand, is becoming more and more apparent in other fields of endeavor. This war has taught many of us that the Christian concept of mutual co-operation of each man with his fellow for the good of the whole human family not only pays dividends in a time of national emergency, but is a policy to be followed in the days of peace which lie ahead. In the home, the school, at the bench, in business life generally the Canadian family is gradually learning to work together as never before.

An outstanding example of the co-operative spirit at work is provided by the group hospitalization plans which have had a phenomenal growth in Canada during the last two or three years. In the most practical way possible they serve to illustrate the great advantages to be gained by the average man co-operating with his fellows.

Group hospitalization has been in operation through a number of plans in the United States for about twelve years but its growth in Canada has been a more recent development. However, with the ever-increasing interest on the part of Canadians generally in measures to provide the working man and woman with greater economic security and the means of enjoying a full, fear-free life, the question of low-cost hospital care has taken a position in the forefront of public opinion.

Statistics indicate that one out of every five Canadian families requires hospital care each year, yet hospitalization is an emergency seldom provided for in advance. All too often the low income worker is forced by circumstances to choose between entering hospital as a public charge, or of trying to pay his own way with whatever small savings he may have managed to accumulate. For many years the unexpected hospital bill has been a calamity of the first order for a large percentage of the Canadian population. It is fortunate, indeed, that the principles of group hospitalization have come to their rescue.

What are known as Blue Cross hospital plans serve some 11,000,000 U. S. citizens today. The keynote of the services which they supply is the co-operation of subscriber-employee with his employer; a formula which has proven overwhelmingly successful. The main principles embodied in these plans have been utilized in the development of the Canadian plans. Most of the latter are units under the Blue Cross emblem which has become a familiar sign in the United States; and are in constant contact with their American counterparts. There are at present Blue Cross hospitalization plans in existence in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba, with a number of city-wide plans operating in such western metropolitan areas as Vancouver, Edmonton and Kamloops. Recently a bill was ratified in the Nova Scotia Legislature incorporating the Maritime Hospital Service Association as the Plan supplying low-cost hospital service in that particular province. It is reported that steps are now being taken towards the extension of this Plan to New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island as well.

The example of the Ontario Hospital Plan is particularly interesting. Plan for Hospital Care, as it is called, is spon-

sored by the Ontario Hospital Association and is probably the most rapidly expanding of all the Canadian plans, with well over 200,000 subscribers representing some 122 cities, towns and villages scattered all over Ontario. The present rate of expansion is in the neighborhood of 10,000 new subscribers a month, thereby giving an ever-increasing number of Ontario citizens access to hospital facilities at minimum cost.

Plan for Hospital Care is a non-profit, co-operative, community service holding an Ontario provincial charter and

The accompanying article is an effective example of co-operative methods meeting a common need. It is felt that the experience gained in such enterprises will be of great value when socialized medicine arrives. Mr. Bell directs the publicity for the organization he describes.

was inaugurated in the public interest through the hospitals represented by the Ontario Hospital Association. Some 150 hospitals in the province co-operate in supplying services to Plan subscribers. This Plan was instituted with the co-operation and approval of the Ontario Department of Health, and all rates and benefits provided are approved by the Ontario Minister of Public Health. It has also been endorsed in principle by the Executive of the Ontario Medical Association and the Council of the Academy of Medicine, Toronto, and is officially approved by the American Hospital Association.

Plan for Hospital Care is not connected in any way with group medical services established by private bodies within the province, but was instituted to enable the Ontario workingman and woman to obtain hospital services when they need them, at small cost. The expense involved in joining a group supplying medical as well as hospital services is invariably prohibitive for the average family man, and this fact is reflected in the comparatively small number of Ontario citizens enrolled in such groups. The fact that over 200,000 persons are enrolled in the Plan speaks for itself.

Enrolment methods, rates and benefits have been carefully planned to give the worker the maximum amount of service at the minimum cost. Subscribers are enrolled in groups only and not as separate individuals. This ensures that a fair, representative cross section of the population is obtained in which the need for hospital service will not exceed the average, thus protecting all subscribers equally. Enrolment is open to employee groups of five or more in places of business where the employer will co-operate by deducting subscriptions from each subscriber's wages or salary. It is stipulated by the Plan that all employees be enrolled in organizations where there are five to ten on the staff; ten employees where there are twenty-five or less; and forty

MOULTON COLLEGE

ESTABLISHED 1888 TORONTO

*Residential and Day
School for Girls*

Grade 1 to University Entrance
Music • Hand Crafts • Sports

88 BLOOR ST. EAST, NEAR YONGE
Easily Reached by Street Cars

For Illustrated Brochure
Write or telephone The Principal
ENQUIRE CONCERNING
ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS

percent. where there are over twenty-five, in order that benefits may be made available.

Some facilities are provided for the enrolling of members of established community organizations such as professional associations (dentists, lawyers, doctors, etc.), Farmers' Co-operatives, Credit Unions and similar groups. Listed in this category are some 26 participating rural Women's Institutes, Ontario farm youth organizations, commercial farming enterprises and government agricultural experimental stations. These represent farmers and rural dwellers in every part of Ontario, from the twin grain ports of Port Arthur and Fort William on the west to the national capital, Ottawa, on the east; from the tobacco belt in the south to the great mining area of Northern Ontario.

Action is being taken through the co-operation of the Manitoba Hospital Service Association (the corresponding hospital plan in that province) to enrol fur traders and trappers employed by the Hudson's Bay Company in the far northern reaches of Ontario, including Baffinland. Thus, these men, who daily face the hazards of life common to the remote regions where they are situated, are able to obtain hospital care for themselves and their families when needed.

Subscription rates of the Ontario Plan are so low as to be within the range of practically any worker's financial resources. For less than two cents a day the single individual can obtain service in any one of the co-operating Ontario hospitals. For an entire family comprising husband, wife and all children under the age of sixteen the cost is less than three and a half cents a day! This amounts to a monthly subscription rate of 50 cents for the single enrollee, providing standard ward service in the hospital. An additional 25 cents procures semi-private service. Similarly the cost for the family man is \$1.00 monthly for standard ward service and \$1.50 for semi-private. All these subscriptions are collected by the comparatively painless payroll deduction method. The single exception to this rule is the case of groups in the northern town of Kapuskasing who have evolved the novel idea of having their subscriptions added to the monthly Hydro-Electric bill!

The Plan requires no physical examination of the subscriber. In fact, all pre-existing and chronic conditions are provided for. It is not unusual for a subscriber to enter hospital and receive full benefits within a few hours or days of being enrolled. If the enrollee should happen to require hospitalization while travelling or residing temporarily in another part of the Dominion or even in the United States, Plan for Hospital Care looks after him just the same. It is also interesting to note that the rejected applicant for commercial insurance is considered completely eligible for enrolment as a subscriber.

Under the Plan the subscriber is entitled to 21 days hospital care in each year. Each member of an enrolled family is also entitled to 21 days. If, for example, a family of five were admitted to hospital at the same time, as is conceivable in cases of fire, accident or epidemic, they would be entitled to a total of 105 days service. The stay of the average patient in hospital is about ten days.

On entering hospital at the order of his own physician the subscriber presents his Plan identification card. The result is no questions about his ability to pay and no delay in providing the necessary facilities for his treatment. Benefits include: accommodation; nursing and dietary service; use of the operating room as often as necessary; use of anaesthesia equipment and materials; electrocardiographic films if necessary; ordinary drugs and medications; routine medical, bio-chemical and basal metabolism tests; dressings and plaster casts, etc. X-rays and doctors' fees are not covered as they are not actually a part of the expenses of

hospitalization and, therefore, the patient must make his own arrangements for paying his own doctor and any doctor who is called in by his doctor for consultation or assistance. It is the hope and intention of the Plan to increase benefits to subscribers as time goes on.

There is no exclusion as to type of disease or illness. Epilepsy, mental disorders, tuberculosis, venereal diseases, smallpox, scarlet fever, etc., are all equally covered. After twelve months participation on the part of husband and wife one-half the hospital charges (up to 12 days) are allowed for maternity, including one-half the charges for the use of the delivery room and nursing care for the newborn child.

Change of occupation on the part of the subscriber entails no loss of benefits as long as the subscription rate is maintained through quarterly, semi-annual or annual payments. Enlisted men in the Canadian armed forces may continue to obtain benefits for their families during their absence, and their own previous contract may be resumed within 30 days of discharge. Included in the long list of present subscriber groups are a number of R.C.A.F. and R.A.F. units. The latter are instruction personnel who have come out to Canada under the Commonwealth Air Training Plan, and who are, through the Plan, securing protection for their families whom they have brought with them.

Represented in the participating subscriber groups is every type of business from meat packers, insurance companies and educational institutions to publishers, hotels and clubs. Ministerial associations and church groups are well represented. Of great importance is the fact that a large percentage of the participating members of Plan for Hospital Care are workers in war industry. Through the facilities supplied they are able to receive prompt treatment for their ills without putting off till tomorrow because of fear of cost; thereby saving hundreds of thousands of vital man hours every year.

Each day men and women in Ontario and in the other provinces of the Dominion where group hospitalization plans are in operation can go about their tasks relieved of the burden of mental strain of how to pay the unexpected hospital bill. This fact in itself pays valuable dividends in improved efficiency, morale and calibre of workmanship.

All this is the achievement of practical applied co-operation. The successful development of the group hospital fund formula is the result of the use of the type of co-operative spirit endorsed in the Christian way of life. It is, in effect, an excellent example of the forward thinking practised by men of vision who see in this particular movement one of the stepping stones to the social and economic security for which mankind has been striving these many centuries.

Tree

Massed leaves

Are jerking sunnily.

They knock crisply above assembled grass.

They hang jaggedly over a village skyline.

Out of dark soil,

Out of cloudlike shadow,

Has come seed-given reticulations of splayed branches,

Wrinkling across the land with sun-and-wind revels,

Receiving the seasons, a variegated island.

The full shape of this green adventurer,

Completely melodious, earth-organized, earth-directed,

Has excited me as a lover.

I am stirred with longing

By plumey currents of foliage,

By the planetary grace of blown twigs.

Alan Creighton

CORRESPONDENCE

The Editor:

In the May issue of *The Canadian Forum*, you congratulated Premier Godbout, of Quebec, for his firm attitude towards the Price Brothers Company, in forcing it to deal with the majority group of its employees, member of the National Catholic Syndicates, in its paper mills at Kenogami, Jonquiere and Riverbend, in the Lake St. John district.

In the June issue of your magazine, we see Mr. Godbout reproached for having done so, in a letter addressed to you by Mr. E. Andras, of Ottawa. Mr. Andras criticizes Mr. Godbout for having been partial towards the National Syndicates' pretending that the International Paper Makers' Union have a contract with Price Brothers which the Syndicates did not want to respect and went on strike against it. It was indeed a dispute between two unions, but the true story of all this is the following:

Our Syndicates were organized since 1937 in those three mills of Price Brothers Company. Although they had the majority in 1937-38-39, the Company never wanted to recognize them, and when Price Brothers signed the contract with the International Union in 1939, that union in every one of the three mills had only a minority of the workers. Therefore, that was a contract which was forced upon the will of three majority groups of workers belonging to our Syndicates through an arbitrarily closed shop. Our members silently suffered that state of things for two years in order to keep their jobs and earn their livelihood.

The proof of all this is the fact that one month before the strike broke out Price Brothers Company was warned by a public notary that a sworn petition signed by the majority of the workers of the three mills was in his office and which asked the Company not to renew its contract with the International Paper Makers' Union, because they would not submit any more to such an unfair and intolerable situation. Was not that a violation of their legitimate rights to belong to the association of their choice?

Particularly in the case of the Kenogami mill the whole membership of the Syndicate repudiated the contract under which they had been subjected for two years.

The Company gave no answer whatever to our Syndicates. On the contrary it flatly stated through posters in the mills its determination to maintain the contract, and began dismissing many members of our Syndicates in the different mills. Could there be a situation more unbearable, more provocative of anger to our members? It is no wonder if the strike broke out. They also wanted to put an end to a situation wherein the International Union was only acting as a mere "shop committee."

Without entering into any other details, this statement of mine will suffice to prove that Mr. E. Andras' contention is not so true as he thinks and that Premier Godbout was not so wrong as he believes.

ALFRED CHARPENTIER,

President of the Canadian and Catholic Confederation of Labor, Montreal, Que.

The Editor:

As you suggest in your discussion of German responsibility, we seem to be aiming at the same goal; but without undue humility I think my road will get us there, and yours will not. May I explore the possibility of further agreement?

"Young minds," you say, "in any country are fatally susceptible to indoctrination." Mythology again, unless you qualify the statement considerably. In the first place, we are not dealing only with young minds. Have you not momentarily forgotten the formidable breadth and depth of the appeal Nazism has made, not to young Germans alone, but among almost all peoples of the earth, at all ages, not least insidiously in North America? Remember, too, how short a time the Nazis have controlled German education. The proportion of adult Germans that has undergone this schooling is comparatively small; it was smaller still in 1939. No German of 18 years or over has yet had the full course. Most adult Germans were educated under the Monarchy or the Republic. If, as we are told, the pattern of education changed under the Nazis, the previous indoctrination seems to have been signally unsuccessful. Even the Nazi pattern is not as efficient as it pretends, if we may trust the reports of disaffection among

students at Munich and other centres. Any system of education, particularly in a state as educationally advanced as Germany was, must be at least accepted and tacitly approved by the mass of the adult population. They may object to details, but they must prefer the program as a whole to its immediate alternatives, or it would get nowhere. I repeat, if they hadn't liked it, they would not have taken to it as they did.

Furthermore, even young minds are not equally susceptible to all kinds of indoctrination. Surely no experienced teacher accepts the theory that the minds of the young are sheets of blank paper on which he can write what he pleases. He can reinforce or discourage the tendencies he already finds there, and some of these are more easily reinforced or discouraged than others. In particular, any doctrine that offers a privileged position has a long head-start in any human mind, even if considerable privations must be accepted as the preliminary price of that position.

There is nothing peculiarly Germanic about this susceptibility. There lies the danger. If we make excuses for the Germans now, we shall be making excuses for ourselves tomorrow. Excuses are not good enough. It is mythology to talk of "the hornswoggled victims of a comparatively small class of designing men." They were not a class, incidentally, in any useful sense of the word, but a motley group of widely differing origins and interests, temporarily held together by a few overmastering interests. It is exactly this talk of victims, with its implication of helplessness, that would smooth the path of a similar group here. I touched on this point in my first letter when I spoke of "deadening the sense of responsibility in all citizens," but somebody slipped in the word "its" before "citizens," which made the sentence meaningless.

If such a group came to power, the responsibility of the Canadian people would not be a different kind of responsibility. It would be the same kind, for it would mean that on the whole we approved of their ends and tolerated their methods. We shall never be alert and resolute against that sort of thing unless we realize that the German people are culpable partners in the enterprise directed by their leaders. Only so is there some hope of seeing that we shall be equally culpable if we permit a similar abomination here.

The problem of punishment is a separate problem, but here too no honest solution can be reached from dishonest premises. If the German people are responsible enough to be trusted with their post-war regeneration, they are responsible enough to take the blame for their present condition. To say that "you cannot indict a nation" (which I am happy to see the *Forum* did not say) is a pretty piece of rhetoric, but no more a statement of fact than to say that you cannot indict a corporation. For us to draw distinctions of responsibility among Germans will do neither them nor us any good. If anyone is to draw distinctions, they will have to do it themselves. Napoleon was as faithless, and as ruthless, and his armies committed quite comparable atrocities. Yet the Allies' action in marking him out for punishment had no conspicuous success. Nor had we any particular reason to regret not hanging the Kaiser.

To develop this question of punishment would be too great a trespass on your space. Let me only say that so long as we continue to stress degrees of responsibility we shall be thinking in terms of vindictive retaliation. If we put punishment on a scale where sheer vengeance is physically too laborious, materially unprofitable, and morally impossible, there is a better chance of discussing it in terms of reparation, reform, and mutual advantage.

L. A. MACKAY.

CANADIAN INSTITUTE ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS

LAKE COUCHICHING, ONTARIO

AUGUST 21st - 28th

Theme:

THE UNITED NATIONS TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

SPEAKERS: Alvin H. Hansen, F. H. Soward, Paul Martin, J. B. Condliffe, Dr. Malcolm Wallace, Leonard Marsh, Sir George Sansom, Graham Spry, W. R. Taylor, Major Gabriel Bonneau, Eugene Staley, Mary McGeachy, R. J. Bunche, Pennington Haile, Harriet L. Moore, Lionel Gelber, Brooke Claxton, Walter S. Woods.

Write: R. E. G. Davis, 3 Willecks Street, Toronto.

The Mourners

William Brown

► THE THREE BOYS walked aimlessly along the street, arguing about whether they should snipe some cigarette butts and go over to the park for a smoke. Johnny and Leo were about eleven and big for their age. Shrimp, who was a year or so older, had a dark and solemn face with an expression of self absorption.

It was early evening and the air was soft and warm with spring, filling the boys with a subtle tension and making them restless and energetic. They did not know what to do with themselves, and, as they walked along, Johnny began to sing, "Here we go, into the wild wind flying, Keep the wings level and true . . ."

Shrimp pulled at his arm. "Shut up," he said.

"What's the matter with you?" Johnny asked, and he crouched and began to weave his arms like a boxer, pretending to be sore and looking for some way to work off his energy.

"Cut it out, you dope," Shrimp said, backing away from him. "Look where we are."

He pointed to a house across the street. Johnny straightened up and thrust his hands in his pockets and the three of them stared at the house in silence. It was small and exactly the same as the other houses on the street with a freshly shaven lawn and a row of spring flowers in front of the porch. The shades were drawn, giving the house the look of a blind and withdrawn man among the sighted.

"Yeah," Johnny said softly. "I forgot."

Leo sneered. "So what? Lots of guys get killed in a war."

"Yeah, but jeez . . ." Shrimp said, his voice trailing away.

"It's funny to think that Al's dead," Johnny said. "Remember how he used to come over to the park and play ball with us even though we were just kids? He was a nice guy."

"What the hell are we mooning around here for?" Leo said nervously. "Come on, let's go over to the park."

He took a few steps down the street but the others did not move and he hesitated and came back. "You guys gimme a pain."

"The paper said he was shot down in the English Channel," Johnny said. "But he got two Germans before they got him."

Leo pointed his finger at Shrimp and made a noise like a machine gun. "Brrrrrrrr . . ."

"Aw, shut up. Al's mother is in there and she can hear you. My old lady was over to see her yesterday just after they got the news and she said Al's mother was in bed and had to have the doctor. So we better be quiet," Shrimp said.

"There's one thing," Johnny said. "At least he got those two Germans."

Shrimp frowned in thought. "I wonder what it was like up there . . ."

"My uncle was in the air force in the last war," Leo said. "He was telling me how you could see the tracer bullets going right into the guy."

"Aw for Chrissake," Shrimp said. "You and that uncle of yours."

They were silent, still watching the house. Leo jumped up and hit with his fingers a No Parking sign hanging from a lamp post. The metal sign rattled noisily and Johnny and Shrimp scowled while Leo grinned defiantly.

Sergeant Pilot—no, Flight Lieutenant—Shrimp Doyle, who looked something like big Al Simpson, climbed into the

cockpit of his fighter plane and headed out towards Germany. Suddenly three enemy planes swooped down at him out of the clouds and they fought, twisting, looping, machine guns blazing and the sky filled with streaking tracer bullets, like he'd seen in that movie. Cool, and planning his moves carefully, Flight Lieutenant Al Simpson-Shrimp Doyle sent two of the German planes down in flames. And then the third plane was on his tail and, as he looped to get behind it, bullets smashed his instrument board, flames leaped from the motor and he was going down into the channel, the flames streaming back in his face and him trapped in the cockpit, the water rushing closer, death . . .

"Aw!" Shrimp said aloud, involuntarily.

"Eh?"

"Nothing," Shrimp said. "I was just coughing." He looked off down the street.

"The guy's nuts," Leo said.

"Come on, let's get out of here," Shrimp said impatiently.

They began to walk again, slowly. Leo, whose father was overseas, asked Shrimp why his father wasn't in the army and hinted that he was yellow. Shrimp told him to close his goddamn trap and they almost fought. Shrimp dropped a little behind the other two and walked in silence while they argued about whether it would be better to be in the air force, the army or the navy. Johnny decided on the navy and Leo said he would like to be a paratrooper or a commando.

"I was reading about it in the paper," Leo said eagerly. "I'll show you how it's done."

Becoming interested in the game they did not see Al's father and mother coming out of the house with the drawn shades.

"I'll be a German sentry and you sneak up on me," Leo said to Shrimp.

Leo stood stiffly under a lamp-post while Shrimp crept up behind him with a stick held like a dagger in his hand. Shrimp was not very enthusiastic about the game and he made a lot of noise. Leo spun around, grabbed him, there was a struggle and the stick dagger was taken away from him.

"That's not the way," Leo said. "I was reading, you stab the guy from behind and you got to be sure you don't get him in the shoulder blade or your knife'll stick or break. Gimme the knife, I'll show you."

Al's father and mother walked slowly down the street, the mother holding tightly to her husband's arm. They both wore black and they stared straight ahead, not speaking to each other.

Leo crept up on Shrimp, being careful not to make any noise. He bared his teeth ferociously. Then, swiftly, he stabbed Shrimp in the back with the stick dagger, being careful to get him in the soft place under the shoulder blade.

"There," he said triumphantly. "That's how it's done."

Al's father and mother disappeared around the corner, an old couple who had lost a son and who were on their way over to the park to see living people around them and to sit on a bench and try to enjoy the little bit of sunlight that was left.

The Canadian Forum

SUBSCRIPTION RATE

One year \$2 Two years \$3

THE CANADIAN FORUM

28 Wellington Street West, Toronto, Canada

The Mental Butterfly

For fear of loving let us love
against the teeth the iron talk
of the exalted aeroplane:
this mouse our happiness, that hawk—

this hope in that aerial view
divided by the bomb sights at
the crossed hairs of the bursting rose
that blooms on the defenceless flat

with petals of eternal blood;
O who shall count the moment, prove
how high this on the beam jive joy
when they have got the range on love

and in Lidice, Guernica
raze all our small town dreams, and strip
kisses apart in kissing with
the skeleton beneath the lip.

And yet in love the moment lives
as with that hour upon the tree
impaling him with equal wrong
that made of Christ, eternity:

will live beyond the hour of love
virginian promise and the glow
of earth that in the inner eye
perceives the summer through the snow,

as when beyond the frozen field
the bare and xerophytic bough
the silenced stream, the clouded sky
the wooded hill denuded now

the singing heart goes through the woods
as if they had not ceased to sing,
and in the mind the butterfly
floats on in an eternal spring.

James Wreford.

Lost Innocence

Forgotten the place,
the timeless time.
The ever-onward, all-engulfing rush dispels
the image;
swiftfumbled
is the fragile efflorescent dust.

Lost in the sleep-trance of immeasurable nights,
tangled in dreams,
refracted in the other-light
of aqueous worlds,
dissolving to absurdity.

By conversation bent,
by idiom battered and by glibness bruised,
lost in the never-ending flow from lip to lip
is the unspoken,
trampled verbosity.

Beseiged from doorways,
bedded
by the painted harlotry of autumn,
fleeing before policing winter winds
and by spring forgotten —
covered with inebriate greenness,
overcome by sudden fragrance,
lost and alone in the young dark under age-bent stars.

Dust-craven hunger by the bare winds driven and laid waste!
O wasted hunger!
O time-driven dust!
O half-forgotten and forever lost!

The small sad voices of the rain
insistently
repeat your name.

Rita Smith.

Church Parade

Rifles chatter,
Bayonets gleam,
The mortar scarfs
The helpless scream.

And cunning traps
Concealed in grass
Drag down to death
The lads who pass.

We do not grieve,
We have no fear,
For Christ we know
Is somewhere near.

Each Sunday morn
In this large shed
The Padre is
Much comforted

To learn from His
Familiar tones
How prayer saved
Their scattered bones.

And void of flesh,
On yonder plain
They rattle through
One more campaign.

Lt. Irving Layton.



CURRENT BOOK

PLAN FOR BRITAIN

by G. D. H. COLE, ANEURIN BEVAN,
JIM GRIFFITHS, L. F. EASTERBROOK,
SIR WM. BEVERIDGE, H. J. LASKI

90c

(membership rate)

(Copies will be supplied to non-members at \$1.10 each.)

Books are published every two months.

Minimum membership period is one year—6 books.

For information write THE CANADIAN FORUM BOOK
SERVICE, representing The Labour Book Service in
Canada.

Books of the Month

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY, Shield of the Republic: Walter Lippmann; McClelland & Stewart (Little, Brown & Company, 1943); pp. XVII+177; \$2.00.

This book is a model of clarity, brevity and—fallacy. It handles a difficult subject in the most lucid and forceful manner. Every statement seems designed to appear self-evident, and to carry the reader along on an irresistible current of logic until he lands at the appointed place. Not until he has got there does he realize that it is not where he wanted to go, or that he is left standing on shifting sands.

Mr. Lippmann's thesis is simple. The American people have lived with a notion of their place in the world which, about the year 1900, ceased to bear any true relation to the facts. The notion was that they were secure from the need for "entangling alliances," and that they could enjoy the luxury of an uninterrupted isolation. The facts were (1) that ever since 1823, when the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed, the United States was committed to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, which commitment she could not possibly maintain unless she had an alliance—tacit or express—with the dominant sea-power on the Atlantic—in other words with Great Britain; and (2) that ever since 1898, when she took over the Philippines, she had a commitment in the Pacific which she could not maintain without an alliance with some major power in that area. Thus the American people had undertaken extensive commitments abroad which they refused to support by the only means by which they could be supported, namely, a proper system of alliances. Hence their foreign policy has been bankrupt for the past 40 years. Twice when challenged by Germany the tacit alliance with Great Britain has come openly to the surface—in 1917 and in 1941. There being no equivalently effective alliance in the Pacific, the United States possessions there were rapidly lost on being challenged by Japan. If peace is to be maintained in the future, it can only be by a frank recognition of the need for a grand alliance between the large powers whose interests are more common than conflicting. The United States, Great Britain, Russia and China are such powers. They can form a "nuclear alliance" to which the other smaller powers will be glad to attach themselves for the security it will give them.

That there is a great deal of sense in this analysis no one could deny. The United States has misunderstood her place in the world. So too, one might add, have Britain, France and other powers. Germany and Japan have grossly misunderstood theirs. The United States does not appear to have committed peculiar errors. And the universality of the mistakes suggests that there is something pretty fundamental about the readjustments people everywhere are being asked to make in their foreign policies. Something has happened to the whole world—not only to the United States. What this thing is Mr. Lippmann does not stop to enquire. For him foreign policy is a system of checks and balances of powers, of areas of commitment and of "national interests." His language is studded with the phrases and terms of power-politics thought. The United States, he says, has not been properly concerned with her "frontiers," her "armaments" and her "alliances." He defines a "foreign commitment" as an obligation "outside the continental limits of the United States which may in the last analysis have to be met by waging war." By "power" he means "the force which is necessary to prevent such a war or to win it if it cannot be prevented." He includes in the term "the rein-

forcements which can be obtained from dependable allies." "The elementary means by which all foreign policy must be conducted," he declares, "are the armed forces of the nation, the arrangement of its strategic position, and the choice of its alliances." To clear the American mind from "prejudices and illusions" he sets out to dissipate the four "mirages" which he thinks corrupted American thought. These illusions were Peace, Disarmament, No Entangling Alliances, and Collective Security. Once these illusions are exposed, he believes we can all think straight.

No doubt "realism"—if that is what it is—is a valuable aid to thought. But it can lead, when carried too far (or not far enough) to as many blunders as the most airy idealism. Why isn't Mr. Lippmann realist enough to see that foreign policy is not a subject all by itself, but merely the outward extension of domestic policy? If the American capitalists can find a continuously expanding market at home (as they did during the 19th and part of this century) they will not be interested in foreign policy; if they have unsold surpluses that need export markets they will soon be interested in finding those markets. The huge surpluses of the U. S. war economy are disposed of now by Lend-Lease and by government purchase. Who will dispose of them after the war—and will this problem not determine U. S. foreign policy? Mr. Lippmann does not enquire. The whole economic aspect of world affairs is scarcely touched on. The same Lippmann who wrote the wholly inadequate and quaintly liberal *Good Society* is writing this book too. One need only contrast *United States Foreign Policy* with Mr. E. H. Carr's *Conditions of Peace* to appreciate how much more profoundly the English liberal faces the underlying issues of employment, monopoly, and subordination of "sovereignty," than does this American counterpart.

Mr. Lippmann's final plan adds up to a sort of glorified "Holy Alliance." It is a League of the Big Four: U. S., Britain, Russia and China. Of course he admits that such a League must not turn aggressive on the smaller powers: the "inexorable logic of their alliance demands that they recognize the liberties of the people outside the alliance." We little fellows won't be overrun because to do so would disturb the "nuclear alliance." We should no doubt be duly thankful.

This whole approach to peace through "power" ends up in a gigantic balance of power. World War No. III is just around this corner. Any alliance—whether "nuclear" or not—is a mere companionate marriage which can be ended at will. Its members are still "sovereign states" (Mr. Lippmann uses the term). It is not law which governs such nations: it is they who make the law. By all means let us bring the great powers to agreement and let us hope they may work together: but unless it is more than an alliance it will last no longer than such alliances in the past. The nations great and small, must be brought under a general binding obligation (not alliance), inescapable and permanent, which every other nation is prepared to enforce. The Big Four must be as subject to the law of nations as everyone else. Then within each nation we must build democratic and popular controls to prevent the state machines falling into the hands of gangsters like Hitler and Mussolini, or slick profit-seeking monopolies. Otherwise we shall be taking our 19th century power politics, making a "Concert of the World" instead of a "Concert of Europe," and waiting for the next global conflict. To build the new world order on the Big Four alliance, just because it is powerful, is about as sensible as it would be to place post-war economic reconstruction in the hands of a super trust made up of General Electric, Alcoa, Imperial Chemicals and Standard Oil. Let the great powers take the lead in establishing the United

Nations World Association which will be strong enough to enforce peace even against its most powerful challengers.

F. R. Scott.

CANADA IN WORLD AFFAIRS, TWO YEARS OF WAR 1939-1941: R. MacGregor Dawson; Oxford University Press; pp. viii+342; \$3.00.

Whether the war has made Canadians a more mature people or not, it seems to have quickened the development towards maturity which has been going on in the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. When Professor Frank Scott's book on Canada Today was published in pre-war year days it caused a tremendous emotional upheaval because it embarked on an unsentimental analysis of Canadian interests, an upheaval whose shocks are still being recorded in Institute seismographs. Mr. Carlton McNaught's examination of how we get our news went through a long and painful editorial revision before its attempt to apply English and American standards to our Canadian newspapers could be allowed to appear in a form that wouldn't make too unpleasant reading for our publishers. But this present volume by Professor Dawson doesn't seem to have been submitted to this process of being reduced to Institutional respectability. All the author's well-known opinions seem to have been permitted expression without restraint or censorship.

At any rate this is a very readable volume on the first two years of Canada's war effort. It starts with a penetrating analysis of the skilful technique employed by Mr. King to carry the country into war without internal divisions, and it goes on through the period of limited liability to the crisis of June, 1940, and the transformation which this brought about in our attitude to the war. It deals with the main issues which arose in internal politics and in our relations with Britain, the United States and other countries. It gives a comprehensive account of the administrative agencies which were organized to meet new needs and of the way in which they worked during these two years. Its balance between admiration for and criticism of the Prime Minister is especially admirable. And throughout the book the fact that the author has a clear point of view of his own helps the reader to understand what the pros and cons of different policies were.

Two main criticisms seem to be worth making of Professor Dawson's work. In the first place the plan which he has adopted of first telling the story in general and then going over it all again in detail involves too much repetition. In the second place his interest in government administration has led him to concentrate rather too much attention upon this subject. For the period of 1939-41 there are no military events to supply a narrative to balance this descriptive analysis of boards and committees. But could not something have been said of the doings of Canadian flyers on many fronts? And the concentration upon government administration means that this is a book primarily not about Canada but about Ottawa. But it is the plain people who are manning the armed forces and working in the factories and on the farms, and it is their opinions, fears, hopes, ideals and prejudices which will in the end determine the part played by Canada in the critical events of our generation. One would like to have learned more of what was going on in their minds and how they were reacting to the demands made of them by the administrators. To write this kind of history would be much more difficult than to give the very competent analysis of administration which Professor Dawson has given. The materials on which it might be based are not easily available. But some attention might have been

given to such evidence as there is about what Canadians thought they were fighting for and what they were saying concerning the post-war world. And if more attention has been paid to the general public we would be a little better prepared, when the next volume in this series appears, for the deep divisions in public opinion which have become manifest since the end of the second year of the war.

However there is so much that is good in this volume that it is unfair to complain too much about what isn't there. Read the discussion of Mr. Howe and the business men in the Department of Munitions, of the political parties, of the question of an Imperial War Cabinet. When you compare this with the kind of stuff which pours forth from most of our daily press you will realize that our Canadian war effort needs just now not more professors in government service at Ottawa but more of them in the editorial offices of our newspapers.

F. H. U.

IN QUEST OF FOSTER PARENTS, 1943: Dorothy Hutchinson; Columbia University Press; pp. 136; \$1.75 (U.S.A.).

In Quest of Foster Parents is an intelligent, technical study, designed primarily for professional social workers, and particularly for those engaged in the finding and supervision of foster homes for children. In this day and age it is scarcely necessary to labor the point that for the child who must, for some reason, be looked after outside his own home, the most normal and happiest substitute is good foster home care. This presupposes a considerable degree of care and skill on the part of the social worker, in choosing the home in the first place, fitting the individual child to it, and thereafter working co-operatively with the foster parents in the common responsibility of planning for his well-being.

As long as there are broken homes, illegitimate children, youngsters with health and behavior difficulties, and neurotic parents, so long will there continue to be a need for good foster homes. In times like these there is a greatly increased demand for such care because of overcrowded housing conditions, and pressure for mothers to take employment in war industries—whatever we may think of the inadvisability of urging mothers of young families to accept full-time employment outside their own homes. The fact remains, whether in time of war or peace, that foster homes, both temporary and permanent, will continue to be necessary for a considerable number of children. This being so, it is, as Miss Hutchinson points out, the part of commonsense to select as foster parents "reasonably normal people, whether rich or poor, educated or uneducated, young or old." There are

READ

NEWS

YOU MIGHT LIKE IT

Judith Robinson
EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTIONS \$2 A YEAR

5c a week—on sale at newsstands

OFFICE: 63 WELLESLEY ST., TORONTO
TELEPHONE RA. 5021

few responsibilities greater than that of choosing a home for a youngster, interpreting the foster home to the child, and the child in turn to the foster parents. The latter can be helped to appreciate the fact that while there are undoubtedly children with difficulties, these are not necessarily, nor even usually, of the youngsters' own making. Problem parents are far more common than problem children, as anyone knows who has watched the amazingly quick adaptation of so-called delinquent children in a happy, stable foster home offering a reasonable number of normal interests.

The good foster mother combines the wisdom of Solomon with the patience of Job. While primarily interested in taking a child into her home, for one of a number of reasons, she finds that she frequently acquires also, in actuality, his parents, his relatives, and the staff member of the agency responsible for looking after him. This sort of situation demands flexibility and adjustments on the part of everyone. Boarding-room rates are proverbially low, but were they doubled or trebled, they could not serve as adequate payment for what the good foster mother does and is. Her services are the kind for which there can be no *quid pro quo* on a cash basis. Adoptive parents take on heavy financial and legal responsibilities, but once the probationary period is over, the child is their own. The boarding-home mother, on the other hand, is asked to take a youngster into her home and treat him as her own, knowing in many cases that eventually he will return to his own home, that while making him happy and giving him the assurance that he belongs in the foster family circle, she must at the same time refrain from any effort to usurp the place of his own parents, and must keep before him the prospect of his return to them. That this is not always an easy task has been brought home of recent years to a wider circle of foster mothers who have taken refugee children into their homes and have come to appreciate the upheaval in normal family relationships engendered by removing a child from the one environment that has meant home and security to him.

As assistant professor of social work in the New York School of Social Work, with a considerable number of years of practical experience in social agencies behind her, Miss Hutchinson can well speak with authority on the delicate matter of finding foster homes. Any thoughtful student of the subject will find stimulation in her provocative discussion of the reasons which lead families to apply as foster parents to agencies, their relationship with the social worker and with the child, the peculiar contribution which they are better fitted than anyone else to make to the child deprived of his own home and parents, and finally of the special problems—which loom very large in Canada in these difficult days—of foster home-finding in wartime.

Elisabeth Wallace.

THIS IS OUR LAND, UKRAINIAN CANADIANS AGAINST HITLER; Raymond Arthur Davies; Progress (Toronto); pp. 158; \$2.00.

This volume argues for the restoration of the property of the Ukrainian Labor Farmer Temple Association and the reinstatement of that organization. An impressive mass of evidence is brought forward to show that the U.L.F.T.A. is ardently pro-United Nations, far more so than the rival Ukrainian Nationalist organization (to which some of the U.L.F.T.A. halls have been sold out of government custody) which is in fact charged with being definitely pro-Axis. If some of the charges are true the R.C.M.P. should get busy in a new direction and the Ukrainian Nationalist Federation should be banned (as it is in the United States) as a subversive organization.

The book, however, is not good enough for the cause it espouses. It sets out to be an interpretation, by a sympathetic but disinterested observer, of the Ukrainian Canadians to their present compatriots. Such an illumination of a very little-known area of Canadian life is very much to be desired. But, presumably from haste, Mr. Davies skips lightly over the important matters of social, economic and cultural background, and throws together a tract for the times, carelessly and sometimes vaguely written, not always with the most desirable documentation.

The U.L.F.T.A. has a very strong case. It could be better presented by one of themselves, if necessary with all the passion that injustice arouses. Of greater importance still would be a dispassionate presentation of the case for all the Ukrainians in Canada, all the facts about the reasons for their coming here, their traditions and skills and their hopes from this country, everything that will explain them to their fellow-Canadians and remove the ridiculous and dangerous attitude that 400,000 people settled here, some of them now third generation, can still be regarded as foreigners. An interpretation on this scale remains to be written.

Kathleen Coburn

THE FORGOTTEN HUME, Le Bon David: Ernest Campbell Mossner; Columbia University Press, 1943; pp. 250; \$3.00 (U.S.A.).

How many men, developing a new and unpopular theory, would go out of their way to point out contradictory evidence? Hume does. The sheer honesty of it impressed me more even than the rigor of his logic. This temper informs all his works, whether on religion or on economics or political science, and must impress any thoughtful reader.

Nevertheless the personal David Hume is seen through a glass darkly nowadays because in his scientific works he is deliberately impersonal and objective, while in the secondary texts through which most students know him, it is the negative conclusions of his enquiry that chiefly appear—and are refuted. He did not have a Boswell to paint him for posterity as his friends knew him, as *le bon David*. This Hume is too much forgotten. *The Forgotten Hume* tries to recall him.

Professor Mossner presents first, Hume's own (8-page!) *My Life*, and then in three parts, his relations to the Scottish Poets (Blacklock, John Home, William Willkie and James Macpherson), the Controversialists (Rev. Robert Wallace and Rousseau. This section is particularly good), and the Johnsonians (chiefly Boswell and at considerable length).

This brings out very well in the concrete setting, those personal, amiable, spiritual characteristics which made him a charming friend and delightful host, generous benefactor, loyal Scot and yet loyal cosmopolite, and vigorous opponent, very firm, yet so difficult for opponents to meet without conversion to respect and affection at least, if not to agreement. The background of these relations are given fully and well. Its interest for readers is therefore wider than that in Hume, including the wider intellectual life of his time and place.

Hume had to win against a very wide and deep prejudice. To most even of his friends, he was a mystery. How could an infidel, an atheist, be so good a man as Hume? Wallace enjoyed and appreciated him in spite of the contradiction. Boswell's explanations, invented successively to calm his own uneasy conscience, are interesting indicators of the intellectual temper abroad. One who in our time is to appreciate him must make the effort to appreciate this atmosphere in

and through which he moved. And those who in our time must oppose corresponding social-moral prejudice would do well to meditate a bit on his character and principles.

W. J. M.

CONTEMPORARY VERSE, A Canadian Quarterly: Alan Crawley, Editor; No. 7, March, 1943; pp. 16; \$1.00 a year, 25c a copy.

PROMISE: Phyllis Adye Pettit; The Crucible Press; pp. 34; 50c.

CHRISTMAS EVE: Laura A. Ridley; The Crucible Press; pp. 16.

FOR REMEMBRANCE: Margaret Complin; privately printed; pp. 21.

THE CYLINDRIAD: H. S. Humphreys; The Cordelia Quarterly; pp. 70; \$1.25.

If high qualities of courage and intellectual fortitude are required for the execution of successful military operations these qualities are still more necessary to one who would assault the present-day world poetically. Kay Smith, in her five poems in the March *Contemporary Verse* has attempted this with quite brilliant results.

Hers is a complex type of work which is the response of a sensitive mind to a complex environment. In poetry, in its expression of fleeting thoughts, anxieties and wishes that barely reach the level of consciousness, we are often startled to find that there has been in the poet's mind an intellectual and emotional activity so similar to our own as to be almost identical. By his words and phrases, as well as by his rhythm and cadence, we identify the work of art that is true of our time and no other.

In this work of Miss Smith one recognizes a poetic mind that has lived sympathetically through these recent terrible years. She writes of the legalized selfishness of the profit motive that demoralizes youth, killing the spirit of man

"Not in an alien clime but HERE where wild geese
cry in front of harvest moons
the sound of scaping where under the cloud-gnarled
sagging prairie sky
you have heard dollars rustle in the sigh of wheat."

It is typical of the vital poet, however, not to be crushed by the weight of his material but to remain, in essence, sufficiently vital to dance away, free as the wind and sun. In "When all the Trees" Kay Smith reflects whimsically upon the warless world of material abundance, social equality and spiritual comradeship that appears to be the present goal of mankind.

"When none need look back to the golden age
or forward to a Phoenix hour . . .
will the dream-come-true last beyond then?"

The rest of the contributions in this number, though meritorious, are on a somewhat lower plane. Miriam D. Waddington's two poems, though vigorous and colorful, are limited to the arena of personal love experiences. Louis Dudek is flowing and songful; he writes smoothly and succinctly of love, night-time and morning, but without much depth. James McDermott's three contributions, though sometimes commonplace in feeling, are admirable for their intellectual poise when one is

"Ill from the spilled blood
Poured out wantonly; torn apart
By the sight of weary, unlivid
Millions . . ."

Promise by Phyllis Adye Pettit is a collection of short poems which treat of the nostalgic reflections of the English immigrant in Canada who has more or less cheerfully ac-

cepted the Canadian scene. It is suggestively English in its air of physical vigor, clear-headed approach to practical matters and its lapses into prose. Laura Ridley's *Christmas Eve* has some twenty-three simply-constructed poems on trees, flowers and friendship. She writes gently and lyrically, and sometimes with a touch of humor, of the sunny side of life. *For Remembrance* is a little booklet of patriotic verses on Canadians in the present war. They are conventional in theme and treatment and are chiefly interesting as a product of these changeful years with the shift of the younger male population to various branches of the armed services.

Turning from poetry to philosophy we find much that is stimulating—to poets, perhaps, more than to philosophers—in Mr. Humphrey's *Cylindriad*. This outlines a philosophical system based on the biologic necessity of the curved surface. The author quotes Cezanne: "The sphere, the cone and the cylinder are nature's fundamental shapes" and the book attempts to show the symbolic significance of these in human, animal and vegetable life.

One develops a philosophical system in order to explain the world about him and most of what Mr. Humphrey has to say, as "fluidity is the law of animal-vegetable life," seems to me to be finely sane and wholesome. Man was happiest when he lived in the green forest and made things of wood. But his close kinship with the cylindricality of vegetable life began to be disregarded with the application of the square—in houses and cities. The coming of angular creations of steel and concrete has been accompanied by a lowering of the quality of the race, with "to many people and not enough human beings," with sexual sterility and contempt for women. Wherever angularity of form appears the spirit of man degenerates. An understanding of the significance of curved surfaces and cylindrical forms will lead mankind to a more reverential and ecstatic appreciation of nature and to greater physical and spiritual health.

In the note of joyful discovery pervading this book I was reminded of Havelock Ellis's *The Dance of Life*. Serious philosophers, however, are hardly likely to find much of value in some of the author's more mystical passages where he is apt to become deliberately dogmatic and obscure, nor to be attracted by his style, which goes from pontifical gravity to exuberant word-playing. Mr. Humphrey is a musician and his book is likely to find its most sympathetic public among musical and artistically-minded readers. Much of the work is, as the author himself states, a product of intuition rather than of scientific thought. Nevertheless, I found his beliefs impressive, perhaps because they have been produced, as it were, by the whole nervous system instead of just the brain alone, working upon a certain hypothesis.

Alan Creighton.

Books and Pamphlets

MAY BE PURCHASED THROUGH THE

Canadian Forum Book Service

28 WELLINGTON ST. WEST - TORONTO

Send price as listed for books (we pay the postage) but add 11% exchange for those published in the U.S.A. Please add postage for pamphlets. Send money order or postal note, or CHEQUE PAYABLE AT PAR.



Be a FARM COMMANDO

We can't Fight if We don't Eat!

HELP PRODUCE FOOD FOR VICTORY

PLAN to spend half a day, a day, or several evenings a week on local farms during the haying and harvesting seasons this summer. Join the thousands of Farm Commandos who "close up shop" or lay down their tools to make "raids" into the country and help farmers take their crops from the land.

Farm Commando Brigades are springing up in Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade, Service Clubs, Churches and other men's organizations all over Ontario. Townsfolk are getting together to make a direct, patriotic contribution to the War Effort by helping to save the crops.

Farm Commandos are paid a minimum of twenty-five cents an hour, and many Commandos contribute these earnings to favourite war charities.

If there is no Farm Commando Brigade forming in your locality, take it up with your own men's organization and get your local Brigade started at once.

Every possible man-hour must be put in during harvesting to prevent irreplaceable loss of food that is essential to the Allied War Effort and to Canada herself!

Your help is needed—NOW! Volunteer in a Farm Commando Brigade and be ready to help when harvest emergencies arise. For full information, forms, etc., write to Ontario Farm Service Force, Parliament Buildings, Toronto, at once.



**TUNE IN
"HELP
WANTED"**



A CBC presentation produced with the co-operation of the Ontario Farm Service Force.

**EVERY WEDNESDAY 7.30 P.M.
CBC NETWORK**

**DOMINION-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE ON FARM LABOUR
AGRICULTURE—LABOUR—EDUCATION**

LIBRARY
OF THE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D.C.